

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 4th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. the Minister for Education is not keeping good health. So, questions on to-day's agenda relating to his Department, viz., questions* Nos. 21 and 47, will be taken up to-morrow."

Ventilation of grievances of Government officers through Legislators.

* 26 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a rule that Government servants or their relatives or friends should not approach members of the Legislative Assembly or Council to have their grievances redressed through the Legislature; and

(b) whether instructions have been issued to heads of departments that they should victimise people who try to get their grievances redressed by approaching—

(1) Members of the Legislature who belong to the Ministerialist group; and

(2) Members of the Legislature who belong to the Opposition?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" (a) According to rule 24 of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules, which are as old as the Government of India Act of 1935, Government servants should not bring or attempt to bring any political or other outside influence to bear upon any superior authority for the furtherance of their interests.

" (b) It is a fact that Government will view with serious displeasure any attempt on the part of a Government servant to influence his or her superior authorities in any manner. Any grievance which the Government servant wishes to be removed must be brought to the notice of the superior authority concerned in the prescribed manner wherein there is ample provision for obtaining justice. To permit officials to approach members of the Legislature would result in unequal opportunities and unfairness besides general demoralization in the services. Any attempt to obtain such influence is therefore considered wrong. The superior authority is

[4th November 1952]

authorized in such cases to issue notice and after following the prescribed procedure, order the withholding of promotion unless the Government servant proves his innocence."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO:—"1935 వ సం॥ నాటి ఇండియా ప్రభుత్వం చట్టం రద్దయినదని, ఇప్పుడు నూతన రాజ్యాంగ చట్టం తయారుచేయబడినదని, దానిలోని fundamental rights ఇవ్వబడినాయని గవర్నమెంటువారికి తెలుసునా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I would like to have notice, Sir."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"1935 వ సం॥ నాటి చట్టం రద్దయింది కనుక దాని ప్రకారం తయారుచేయబడ్డ conduct rules ను రద్దుచేసి నూతన రాజ్యాంగ చట్టం ప్రకారం కొత్త service rules తయారుచేయుటకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఆలోచిస్తున్నారా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The existing rules are quite good."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"నూతన రాజ్యాంగ చట్టం తయారుచేయబడింది. దాని ప్రకారం కొన్ని వ్యక్తి సత్వాలకు కలుగజేయబడ్డాయి. వాటి ప్రకారం ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు వారికి కలుగు ఇబ్బందులను ప్రజాప్రతినిధులకు తెలుపుకొనుట నిశ్చయించుట ప్రభుత్వంవారు రాజ్యాంగ విధులను నిరాకరించినవారు కాదా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The influence of Members of the Legislature was much less in the old days than now. At the present moment, the rules are more necessary."

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER:—"Is the Government of India Act, 1935, still in force?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The Government of India Act is not in force now, but the rules of that time are in force."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"ఈ ఆనెట్లని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఒక మీరుమ్మా చేయదలచారా లేక నిజమైన ప్రజాస్వామిక సంస్థగా నిర్వహించ దలచారా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am sorry, Sir, I have to ask for notice."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"ప్రభుత్వంవారు తమ క్రింది ఉద్యోగులు పెట్టుకొనే ఆర్డీలను దర్యాప్తు చేస్తారని న్యాయా న్యాయాలను విచారిస్తారని మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. కాని ఇది వాస్తవ పరిస్థితులకు భిన్నంగా ఉన్నది. మా జిల్లాలో కె. సరసింహం అనే ఆర్టిక గుమాస్తా ఎన్ని పర్యాయములు తన డిఫ్ ఫెన్సివ్ ను గురించి ఆర్డీలు పెట్టుకొన్నప్పటికీ అవి బుట్టదాఖలు చేయబడ్డాయి. అటువంటి సందర్భంలో ఆతడు తనను గురించి శాసన సభ్యులవ్వారా ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియజేయగూడదని మంత్రిగారి యాచనా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am sure, Sir, that the hon. Gentleman, who is asking the question, has not listened sympathetically to what I have said in

4th November 1952]

answer to the primary question. If only the hon. Gentleman will go home and consider my answer, I am sure he will be satisfied with the position."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" Sir, the answer of the Hon. the Chief Minister is rather elastic. Does it prevent hon. Members from bringing to the notice of the Government any irregularities that may prevail in different offices? Will that lead to penalization of any of the employees of the Government? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" No, Sir. That will not lead to penalization and it is not considered wrong. But the penalization is in respect of any particular official trying to get pressure put on Government in his particular interest."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—" శాసన సభ్యులు మంత్రిలు కూడా ఉద్యోగస్తుల వోట్లను కూడా సంపాదించి ఎన్నికైన వారే. అటువంటి సందర్భంలో ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగులు తమ ఉద్యోగంలను గురించి శాసనసభ్యులకు తెలియజేసుకొనకుండా చేయడం విరుద్ధం కాదా? "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, what the hon. Member asks is this. In taking the particular position, do the Government realize that the Members of the Legislature including the Ministers are persons who have been returned on the votes of the Government servants also? Are they not entitled to represent the grievances of the Government employees? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" In democracy it is a question of balance of expediencies as to how far Government servants who are also voters should be entitled to exercise their political position and power in favour of their own personal interests. Everything considered, the present rule is good and I would beg of hon. Members to let it stand. It is, in their own interests, good; it is, in the interests of the Government servants, good; it is, in the interests of the Government as a whole, good."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" In a case where an employee is victimised wantonly by his immediate superior officer and by his higher officer also, what is the way in which he can get justice done to him? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If victimisation is assumed and can be proved, there are plenty of ways by which he can get justice done to him."

SRI V. V. RAMASAMI :—" Will a Member of the Legislature be in order if he brings cases to the notice of a Minister or a Head of a Department, if he is convinced that a gross injustice has been done to an employee or employees? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If there is any irregularity in the administration, it is open to Members of the Legislature to bring it to the notice of the Government

[4th November 1952]

and to press for correction. But in the interests of a particular Government employee who approaches a Member, Government do not approve of the power and position of Members of the Legislature being utilized by the particular person. The position is perfectly clear."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Will it be conceded by the Hon. the Chief Minister that, if there is a gross injustice done to any person within the jurisdiction of his Chief Ministership, it will be right for us to draw his attention to it and, if so, where we are convinced and where the facts show that injustice has been done to a Government servant, may I know why we are prevented from drawing the attention of the Government to it and why it is confused with and considered as exerting political pressure? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" There are Courts, for instances, and a Court is bound to deal justice to parties before it. Would it be right for a Member of the Legislature to go to the Court and use his own judgment and discretion and position to convince the Judge that a particular party's case is right and another's is wrong? The answer is obvious. Now, I submit that every decision in the administrative departments, with reference to particular interests or particular employees, is a matter of judicial discretion, and interference is not right, because, as I said very clearly, it will lead to unequal influences with various persons and it will be unfair to the other employee who gains or loses. These are positions which I want hon. Members to consider. It is not an infraction or detraction of the rights, duties and privileges of Members of the Legislature, but it is only to prevent unfair advantage being taken of relationship or approachability or intimacy."

10-40
a.m.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" May I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister whether he is not mistaken in comparing the position of the executive with that of the judiciary? Because, in the case of the executive, there are several matters done behind the scenes without the knowledge of the parties concerned, whereas everything is done openly in the case of Courts. Therefore, will the Hon. the Chief Minister concede that the Members of the Legislature have got a right to draw the attention of the Government to any particular injustice when it comes to their notice, just as they have got a right to draw the attention of the Government to any other difficulty and that this should not be mistaken as exerting 'political pressure' ? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" This is, I submit, a vast field for discussion. I have said enough. My hon. Friend, the Leader of the Opposition, might take into account the fact that if Members of the Legislature are approached, they are approached not publicly, but privately by the Government servant concerned. The points are not exhausted always, and there will certainly be injustice if interference is allowed. There will be confusion besides

4th November 1952]

injustice and general loss of confidence in the Government as also in the Legislature. But the point that is particularly raised is that in the one case it is the judicial and in the other case it is not judicial. I submit, Sir, that every decision is a judicial decision and when an officer says that A is entitled to promotion and not B, it is as much a judicial decision as any other."

Representations received from the scavengers of Tanjore Municipality.

* 27 Q.—SRI S. RAMALINGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representations have been received by the Government from the scavengers of Tanjore Municipality who were discharged from service for taking part in the strike of March 1948; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken or propose to take thereon?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) & (b) A petition addressed to the Chief Secretary was received. A copy of the petition had been sent to the Municipal Commissioner also. So no action was taken as the petition was not addressed to Government through the proper channel and it was expected that the Commissioner would initiate action on any matter requiring Government's intervention.”

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—“தஞ்சை நகரத்திலிருந்த நகர சுத்தித் தொழிலாளர்கள் பெருவாரியாக வேலையில்லிருந்து நீக்கப்பட்டு மூன்று வருட காலமாக வேலையில்லாமல் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிற விஷயத்தை சர்க்காருக்கும், சர்க்கார் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மேலதிகாரிகளுக்கும் பல மனாக்கள் மூலம் தெரிவித்திருந்தும் இது வரைக்கும் எந்தவிதமான நடவடிக்கையும் எடுக்கவில்லையென மந்திரி அவர்களே இப்பொழுது சொல்லுவதால் இனி மேலாவது உடனடியாக தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பதற்கு சர்க்கார் யோசிக்குமா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“I am not able to understand the question, Sir.”

Supersession of the Yellamanchili Panchayat Board.

* 28 Q.—SRI P. BAPU NAIDU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Yellamanchili Panchayat Board in Visakhapatnam district has been superseded;

(b) if so, why;

(c) whether the Government have received any representation stating that the supersession was unjust; and

(d) if so, the action taken thereon?

[4th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“(a) Yes; by the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, under the powers under Section 48 (1) of the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1950, delegated to him by Government.

“(b) The step was taken as the panchayat had in as many as nine instances, exceeded or abused the powers vested in it under the Act.

“(c) Yes.

“(d) Government have called for a report from the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards on receipt of which the representation will be examined and suitable orders passed.”

SRI P. BAPU NAIDU :—“నాకు ఇంగ్లీషు తెలియదు.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Sir, the hon. Member Sri Bapu Naidu says that he cannot understand English.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“If the Hon. Minister will agree to translate his answer in Telugu, I have no objection.”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“(a) ఆవును. పంచాయతీ చట్టం సె 48 (1) ప్రకారం I.L.B. కి దఖలుపరచబడ్డ ఆధికారాల రీత్యాచర్య తీసుకొనబడింది.

“(b) ఆ పంచాయతీ బోర్డు తొమ్మిది సందర్భాలలో ఆధికారం దుర్వినియోగం చేయడవల్ల ఈ చర్య తీసుకొనబడింది.

“(c) ఆవును.

“(d) గవర్నమెంటువారు రిపోర్టు అడిగిఉన్నారు. అది ఉందిన తర్వాత దానిపై ఆర్డర్లు పాస్ చేస్తాము.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“పంచాయతీ బోర్డును ఎప్పుడు రద్దు చేశారు. గవర్నమెంటు, దానికి అనుకూలంగా లేని లోకల్ బోర్డులను సూపర్ సేడ్ చేయడం ఇకముందైనా మానుకొంటుందా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“I have no information as to the date when it was superseded. I think the Government have to exercise their power, whenever a panchayat goes wrong.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“As per the representation made by the Panchayat Board, can we expect that the Inspector of Local Boards will conduct an enquiry?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“A report has been called for from him. He will certainly enquire and report.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“In cases of supersession, is it the policy of the Government to immediately hold elections and hand back the panchayats to the people?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“Supersessions are made with a time-limit and within that time-limit, elections will be held.”

4th November 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ పంచాయతీ బోర్డు రద్దు చేయడైన తరువాత ఎన్ని రోజులకు ప్రభుత్వంవారికి representation వచ్చింది. Representation చేయబడినతరువాత, ఎన్ని రోజులకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు చర్య తీసుకున్నారు. వారు అడిగిన రిపోర్టును Inspector of Local Boards ఎప్పుడు పంపించారో తెలియజేస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ Soon after any representation is received, we call for a report and the officers take sometime to go and enquire into the matter and submit a report. So, I cannot give all the dates now.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ మంత్రిగారు సమాధానం చెబుతూ తొమ్మిది సందర్భాలలో పంచాయతీ బోర్డు అధికార దుర్వినియోగం చేయబడుటపై దానిని రద్దుచేయవలసినవచ్చినదని సమాధానం చెప్పారు. ఈ తొమ్మిది సందర్భాలలో నిజంగా పంచాయతీ బోర్డువారు అధికార దుర్వినియోగం చేశారా లేక అధికారులే అధికార దుర్వినియోగం చేశారా అనే విషయాలు ప్రభుత్వంవారు పునః పరిశీలన చేసిన తరువాతనే ఆ ఆర్డర్లను ఖాయపరచడమో, నిబుళువల చేయడమో మంచిది కాదా అని మంత్రిగారిని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The Government will certainly go into the matter in detail. But, I want notice to give information.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఆర్డర్లు పాసు చేసే వరకు లోకల్ బోర్డు ఇన్ స్పెక్టరుగారు చేసిన ఊర్తరుభల నిబుళువలచేయరాదా ? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ Stay may be granted in certain very good cases and on very good grounds.”

SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—“ నాకు నిజంగా ఇంగ్లీషురాదు. తెలుగు మాత్రమే తెలుసు. కాబట్టి తెలుగుతెలిసిన మంత్రిగారు సమాధానం తెలుగులో చెప్పవలసిన స్పీకర్ గారికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. అప్పుడే నేను స్టేట్ మెంటరీ క్రక్తులు వేయడం సాధ్యమవుతుంది.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The hon. Member says that he does not know English at all and that if the answer is given in Telugu he will be able to put supplementary questions.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ How is it possible? There are other hon. Members also who do not know English at all. Is it possible to translate all the answers in all the languages? ”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I do not want to come in the way of your decision, Sir. The hon. Member has taken the trouble of putting an interpellation and he is ignorant of English. So, if the Hon. Minister knows Telugu, he may translate his answer in Telugu, otherwise he need not.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There are Tamilian and Malayalee Members also. If I accede to the request of the hon. Member now, then they also may want translations in Tamil and Malayalam.”

[4th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I have only put my point of view before you, Sir."

10-50 a.m. SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Did the Government consider the question of staying action in the matter of supersession in this particular case? "

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" The Government examined the question when the representation was made and they did not feel that a stay was necessary in this matter."

Installation of a calendering machine in Rayalaseema.

* 29 Q.—SRI S. NARAYANAPPA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representation has been received by the Government regarding the installation of a calendering machine to facilitate the operations of weavers in Rayalaseema;

(b) if so, what is the proposal of the Government in the matter; and

(c) what is the probable expenditure to be incurred on such installation?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) No, Sir.

" (b) & (c) Does not arise."

SRI S. NARAYANAPPA :—" In view of the acute depression in the sale of handloom goods, will the Government consider the desirability of installing a calendering machine in Rayalaseema in order to give a sort of encouragement to the handloom weavers so that they may be able to get their goods calendered to suit the present market and to invite the attention of the consumer to such goods? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Notice, Sir."

Ban on Telugu play " Mundadugu ".

* 30 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether there is a ban on the performance of " Mundadugu " drama (Telugu); and if so, why?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" The drama was banned in 1946 because the Government considered that it was defamatory in nature."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" ఈ నాటకాన్ని మహామర్మముగా చూడ ఒక నాడు చూచి ఇది చాలా వాగుందని స్పటిఫికేట్లుగా ఇచ్చిన విషయము ప్రభుత్వము పకు తెలుసునా."

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" A separate question may be put, Sir."

4th November 1952]

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ ബഹു മന്ത്രി അപകീർത്തികരമെന്നു പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. ആകാണു് അപകീർത്തികരമെന്നു പറയുവാൻ കഴിയുമോ ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ നാട്ടിനക്കം. ”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Is the Hon. the Minister for Law aware of the fact that the drama was put on boards in the immediate presence and under the patronage of the Finance Minister of the day ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ I am not aware, Sir. ”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ On the basis of whose reports did the Government ban the drama ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ The Collector's recommendation was considered in this matter. ”

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—“ വേറെ വല്ല നടകളാലും ഈ സ്റ്റേജിൽ നിരോധിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ ? ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ ഏതെല്ലാമാണു് ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ ഉവ്വ. വേറെ ചോദ്യം ചോദിച്ചാൽ ഏതെല്ലാമെന്നു പറയാം. ”

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—“ നാടകങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി ഡിഡിപറയാൻ പോലീസ് റിപ്പോർട്ടുകൾ എടുക്കാറുണ്ടോ ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ Police report is also called for. ”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ കൊള്ളക്കാരായ ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് സാമ്രാജ്യവാദികൾ ജനറൽ കെ. ഡാവിന്റെ നേതൃത്വത്തിൽ ജാലിയൻ വാലാബാഗിൽ വെച്ച് നമ്മുടെ ആയിരക്കണക്കിലുള്ള ജനങ്ങളെ കൊല്ലുകയും 1921 ലെ മലബാർ ലാപ്പിള ലഹളയെന്നു പറയപ്പെടുന്ന ക്രാന്തിക കലാപത്തിൽ വേരുകളിൽ കൂടിക്കുരുക്കുകയും ചെയ്തതും നാടകവേഷയിൽ ചിത്രീകരിക്കുന്നത് സർവ്വോപദ്രോഹം ആവകീർത്തികരമാകുമായിരിക്കാം ; പക്ഷെ അത് നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിന്നു അപകീർത്തികരമാകുമോയെന്നു് ബഹു മന്ത്രി പറഞ്ഞാൽ കൊള്ളാം ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ That does not arise here. ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ సాటకాన్ని నిషేధించడం జిల్లా కలెక్టరుయొక్క రిపోర్టును ఆధారంగా తీసుకొని పోలీసులు ప్రభుత్వము సమాధానము చెప్పారు. కాని ముంత్రి, విమర్శనాత్మక మంత్రి, ఆర్థిక శాఖ మంత్రి మొదలగువారు స్వయముగా చూచి, ఆ సాటకం వాగుండున అభినందించిన తరువాతనూడా దీని విషయమై జిల్లా కలెక్టరుయొక్క రిపోర్టుపై ఆధారపడి దీనిని నిషేధించడమనేది సరియైన పద్ధతి అని భక్తుటికీ ప్రభుత్వంవారు అనుకొంటున్నారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ A separate question may be put. ”

Ban on Telugu play “ Mabhoomi ”.

* 31 Q.—**SRI V. RAMA RAO :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether there is any ban on the performance of “ Mabhoomi ” drama (Telugu) and if so, why?

[4th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" Yes. The drama was banned in 1948 because the Government considered that it was defamatory in nature and was likely to corrupt the persons present at the performance."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" The Hon. Minister said that he will take the police report into consideration to ban the drama. Does the Hon. Minister think that the cultural development of the country by means of dramas must depend on the police reports about them? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" The Government also will examine it. I had occasion to read the translation of this drama and I am also of the opinion that it is likely to corrupt the persons present at the performance."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" ఈ నాటకాన్ని నిశ్చయించడం తొలగించడాన్ని గురించి అలాగే చివరకానికీ విమర్శన అభ్యంతరం ఉన్నదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" A separate question may be put."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" The Hon. the Minister was pleased to say that he read the translation and that he was also of the opinion that those who read it would be corrupted. May I know what the implications of the word 'corruption' are? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" As is shown in the Oxford Dictionary." (Laughter.)

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—" మా భామి " నాటక ప్రదర్శకులను చూచి నటుల-టి మంత్రులు ఎంతవరకు చెడిపోయినారనే విషయాన్ని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" A separate question may be put."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" With reference to 'as shown in Oxford Dictionary', may I ask the Minister when he referred to the Dictionary and how he has connected the meaning given there with the sense in which he has used the word 'corruption' now? What are the relevant portions he has referred to as corrupting? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" I have not used the word 'corruption'. I refer to the Oxford Dictionary as and when occasion arises."

SRI V. SRIKRISHNA :—" వ్యభిచారమును ప్రోత్సహిస్తున్నటువంటి సినిమా ప్రదర్శకులకుగూడా అనుమతిస్తున్నటువంటి ప్రభుత్వము ఇటువంటి నాటకాలను తొలగించుటకు అవకాశమిస్తుందా? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" A separate question may be put."

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ A separate question may be put.”

[4th November 1952]

Report of the Committee on the Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive.

* 33 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether a fact-finding commission was appointed to enquire into and report on the working of the Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive and if so, whether the Committee submitted its report; and

(b) whether a copy of the report will be made available to the members of the Legislature?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“(a) A Committee composed of a Judge of the High Court and a Member of the Board of Revenue has been appointed by Government to review the working of the Scheme of Separation for the purpose of eliminating administrative difficulties, if any, in the working of the scheme. The report of the Committee has not yet been received. Meanwhile, interim recommendations made by them are attended to.

“(b) Yes, if desired, but not before the preliminary examination is over and the printing is done.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“I heard the Hon. the Minister for Law say that certain recommendations were made—interim recommendations—and acted upon by the Government. As they have already been implemented, may I know what those recommendations were?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Such as the repair of certain court-houses, addition to court-houses and such other minor matters which are urgent though they may look unimportant in a big House like this.”

11 a.m. SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“Sir, if the report of the Committee is favourable will the Government introduce the Separation Scheme in the rest of the districts without any exception?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“Sir, I am not aware of the contents of the report and so I am not able to answer the question.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“Fact-finding commission అనేది ఉన్నది. దీనిని పేరుకు గాను నియమించుకొని, లేకపోతే ప్రధానమైన వివిధ సమస్యలను పరిశీలించి చర్చించడానికి నియమించబడింది అని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“Sir, if the hon. Member had listened to my answer he would not have put this question. It was done for the purpose of eliminating administrative difficulties, if any, in the working of the scheme. It is not a fact-finding committee.”

[4th November 1952]

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—" May I know, Sir, whether the scheme would be extended to Tanjore district? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" We will examine it."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" జరిపియరీని ఏ ఏజన్సీకి సెంటి separate చేయడానికి ఛీఫ్ మినిస్టరు ఫ్యాక్ ఫిండింగ్ కమిషన్ ను ఏర్పాటు నిజమేనా? Fact-finding commission ను ఏర్పాటు చేసినమాట నిజమేనా? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" A separate question may be put."

SRI N. N. SUVARNA :—" May I know, Sir, whether this scheme of separation of the judiciary from the executive will be extended to South Kanara this year? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" It will be decided after the report is received."

Representations from the Burmah Evacuees' Association, Yellamanchili.

* 34 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any report from the Burmah Evacuees' Association, Yellamanchili, pointing out maladministration in the Indian Evacuees' and Dependents' Spinning and Weaving Co-operative Society of Yellamanchili, Visakhapatnam district; and

(b) if so, the action taken so far?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" (a) Yes, Sir."

" (b) The matter is under examination of Government."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" May I know, Sir, how much time this examination will take? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Reasonably short time, Sir."

Government Hospital, Munagala.

* 35 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the year in which the Government Hospital had been sanctioned in Munagala, Nandigama taluk;

(b) where it was located;

(c) whether it was made permanent; and

(d) if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" (a) The Government sanctioned the provincialization of the Local Fund Hospital, Munagala, as a permanent measure with effect from 1st January 1949.

[4th November 1952]

“(b) The Hospital was located in a part of the Local Fund Travellers' Bungalow and is being continued to be located temporarily there until separate buildings are constructed.

“(c) & (d) The question is not understood. The Government have taken over the hospital on a permanent basis and have sanctioned the acquisition of a site for the construction of a hospital and quarters for the staff.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ దీనికి వర్తనెంటు చిల్డింగులు కట్టుడానికి ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఏమైనా plans, అంజనాలు వేసిందా, ఎప్పుడు వర్తనెంటు చిల్డింగులు కట్టుతారో చెప్పగలరా ? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ Notice, Sir.”

Weekly searches of Communist prisoners in jails.

* 36 Q.—**SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether the practice of weekly naked searches of Communist convicted prisoners still continues in Salem and other Central Jails?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ There never was nor is now any practice at all of conducting weekly naked searches of convicted prisoners belonging to the Communist Party either in the Central Jail, Salem or in any other Central Jail. As required under the rules all searches of prisoners on prescribed occasions are made with due regard to decency and with reasonable privacy.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ అధ్యక్ష, నేను నేలము సెంట్రల్ జైలులో 1949 లోనూ, మరికొంత కాలము 1950 లోనూ ఉండినాను. ఆప్పుడు నేను స్వయంముగా అక్కడి పరిస్థితులు చూచాను. ఆ కాలంలో నేలం జైలులో జరిగిన కార్యాల గురించి యిక్కడ ఉన్న వారిందరికీ తెలిసిన విషయమే. ఆప్పుడు ప్రతి వారినీ naked searches చేస్తూ ఉండేవారు. నన్ను కూడ నిలబెట్టి naked గా అసగా చిరోచిత్రంగా చేసి సోదా చేయాలని నట్టుబట్టారు. మేము అట్లే పించినా కూడా వినకుండా ఈ దిక్షంబర సోదాలు చేసేవారు.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Is the hon. Member making a speech ? ”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ He is framing the question.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ నేను ప్రశ్నను form చేస్తున్నానండీ. ఆ సందర్భములో ప్రభుత్వమునకు అక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి నేలం జైలులో ఫెడరల్ గా పరిశీలన గురించి తెలియజేశాము. కాని ప్రభుత్వము ఇప్పుడు అటువంటి సోదాలు విమి అక్కడ జరగలేదని చెప్పడం అంటే వాటిని కప్పి వుచ్చడం తప్ప మరేమనీ అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ A separate question may be put.”

4th November 1952]

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Did the Government get any memorandum from the Communist convicted prisoners of Salem Jail objecting to naked searches that are going on in that jail? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ A separate question may be put.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ തടവുകാർ നഗ്നമായ രേഖാ നകം വിധിയനുസരിച്ചുവന്നു. ആരോടും ഇരു സഭകളിലേക്കും ഇപ്പോൾ വരികമില്ല; അത് പ്രതിഷേധം തടവുകാർ തന്നെ ഗവണ്മെന്റിനോടു കൈമാറ്റം ചെയ്തുകൊടുത്തു. ഇതു സംബന്ധിച്ച ശരിയായ കാര്യങ്ങളെക്കുറിച്ചും നടപടികളെയും ഉപരിക മന്ത്രിയുടെ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് വാഗ്ദാനം തയ്യാറാക്കുന്നു? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ I have made enquiries about it and the answer is in pursuance of those enquiries.”

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI :—“ ఆ సెంట్రల్ సభ్యులు కూడా జైలులో పరిస్థితులను విచారించడానికి. అవికాశమున్నదా? వారు పోయినప్పుడు అక్కడ వారికి అనుకూలమైనదా? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ A separate question may be put.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ మంత్రిగారు అక్కడికి పోయినప్పుడు మంత్రిగారి ఎడట ఫ్రీడిను naked searches చేసేవారు కాదు. కాని వారు పోయిన తరువాత, ఆ వ్యవస్థ బిగ్గి. అక్కడ పూర్వము ఉన్నటువంటి Superintendent ఏ విధంగా ప్రవర్తిస్తూ ఉండేవాడో, ఈ సారికి కూడా అదేవిధంగా ప్రవర్తిస్తున్నాడు. అక్కడ ఫ్రీడిను ఏ విధంగా హింసచేడు తున్నారో విషయాన్ని అక్కడ సభ్యులందరూ విచారించడానికి, ప్రభుత్వము సిద్ధముగా యున్నదా? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ A separate question may be put.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ మంత్రిగారు నా ప్రశ్నకు సమాధానము చెప్పలేదు.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Sir, in order to avoid any confusion and misunderstanding will the Hon. Minister assure the House that even today naked searches are not carried out in Salem Jail? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I hope my Hon. Colleague will forgive me if I intervene. The question is taking a different turn. I submit it is wrong for the hon. Members to assume that searches are wrong. If searches are made maliciously for the purpose of disgusting or annoying, they are wrong. But if a search has to be made, the search has to be made and mostly it has to be made thoroughly. If a person secrets something in a place where it has to be searched for, it has to be done. The question therefore is whether the search is malicious or honest and justifiable. Government cannot afford in the case of prisoners to give up searches.”

4th November 1952]

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN :—“ பி. மெமோ கொடுக்கும்பொழுது சாகுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட நிலங்களில் பயிர்கள் இருந்தால் பயிரை அழிக்காமல், அபராதத்தை மாதிரம் வசூலிக்க ஏற்பாடு செய்யப்படுமா ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I think I will have to examine this question, Sir.” 11-10 a.m.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ இந்தக் கேள்வி சபைக்கு வந்த பிறகும் கூட மந்திரி ‘மெமோராண்டம் அனுப்பியது எனக்குத் தெரியாது’ என்றால் அவரிடமுள்ள ஆபீசர்கள் எதையுமே இவரிடம் தொலிப்பது கிடையாதா ? ” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ சில மீட்டர்ஸ் (Renewed laughter.) ”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that in some of the poramboke lands where crops had been raised by tenants, the Collector of Chingleput district made use of cattle to destroy them because he was not prepared to waive the arrears of rent due from the tenants? Is such a step justifiable in these days of food shortage? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The hon. Member has always got the peculiar knack of jumping from one district to the other, Sir. He has now referred to Chingleput district.”

Scheme of house-rent allowance sanctioned to Government servants.

* 38 Q.—**SRI K. KRISHNA RAO** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Accommodation Control be pleased to state—

(a) what percentage the rent allowance paid to Government employees in the city should normally bear to the rent for houses allotted to them;

(b) the proportion the basic salary of Government employees should bear to the rent fixed for houses allotted to them in the city; and

(c) whether the fixing of rent for an allotted house at a figure greater than 20 per cent of the salary (basic) is prohibited?

THE HON. RAJA SRI SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :—“ (a) Under the scheme of house-rent allowance sanctioned to Government servants employed both in the City and mufassal who are in receipt of pay not exceeding Rs. 150, the allowance bears no relation to the rent actually paid by the Government servants who are allotted houses. The rules governing house-rent allowance provide that it shall be admissible to Government servants within the above pay-limit, who are not entitled to free quarters in lieu of Madras House Allowance or any other house allowance that they may be drawing.

As regards Government servants who are drawing more than Rs. 150, no house-rent allowance is paid. As regards those who belong to a cadre of service liable to be employed either

[4th November 1952]

in the Madras City or in the mufassal, if employed in Madras City, they are eligible for Madras House Allowance when the house rent actually paid by them is in excess of 10 per cent of their emoluments, if the house is unfurnished, or 12½ per cent if furnished. The amount of the allowance will be the actual excess over 10 or 12½ per cent of the emoluments, as the case may be, subject to certain maxima prescribed in rule 13 on pages 7-9 of the Madras Manual of Special Pay and Allowances, Volume I, extract of which is placed ^a on the table of the House.

“(b) The rent payable for houses allotted under the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1949, is the rent demanded by the house owner or the fair rent fixed by the Rent Controller, as the case may be, irrespective of the pay of the employee.

“(c) No.”

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—“In view of the high cost of living, will the Hon. Minister consider the desirability of extending the grant of house-rent allowance to Government employees who are residing in big towns, though not in municipalities?”

THE HON. RAJA SRI SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI:—“A separate question may be put.”

Non-confirmation of certain non-gazetted officers in the Revenue Department in Malabar district.

* 39 Q.—**JANAB KUNHI MUHAMMAD SHAFEE**: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of non-gazetted officer in the Revenue Department in Malabar district with a service of 15 years or above who are not yet confirmed;

(b) the number of such officers in each grade; and

(c) the reasons, if any, for their non-confirmation in general.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a) 11 (eleven).

“(b) Lower division clerks	...	...	...	6
Upper division clerks	...	...	...	3
Deputy Tahsildars	...	...	...	2

“(c) The earliest of the existing vacancies arose on 16th April 1943. In 1945, orders were passed that no vacancy which has to be reserved to be filled by War Service Candidates and which occurred on or after 1st April 1943, should until further orders, be filled by the appointment of approved probationers already in service. In 1947, final orders were issued for filling up the substantive vacancies. The Collector then reported the number of vacancies that remained to be filled and the persons to be confirmed to the Board of Revenue.

4th November 1952]

for instructions on certain points, and orders thereon were issued by the Board in June 1951. The Collector thereupon took up the question of confirmation and the vacancies will be filled up soon. It is however pointed out in this connection that the persons awaiting confirmation will be confirmed in their turn with retrospective effect from the dates on which the vacancies arose and the delay in passing the formal orders of confirmation will not adversely affect the interests of the persons concerned."

Annual grants given to the Madras State Co-operative Union.

* 40 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state whether the Government give any annual grant to—

- (1) the Madras Provincial Co-operative Union, Madras;
- (2) Andhra Desa Co-operative Union, Rajahmundry; and
- (3) The Tamilnad Co-operative Federation, Coimbatore. and if so, the amount and the purpose for which the grant is made?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Two different annual grants are given by the Government to the Madras State Co-operative Union—

- (1) An annual grant, being the subsidy to meet the cost of the non-official lecturers of the mufassal Co-operative Training Institutes, at Tanjore and Coimbatore, is distributed to the Institutes through the State Co-operative Union. The amount of the grant varies from year to year in accordance with the cost of emoluments paid to the lecturers by the Institutes in the time-scale of their pay and other allowances. A sum of Rs. 6,200 was granted for the year 1951-52. This grant made to the Coimbatore and Tanjore Institutes is in lieu of the free services of departmental officers to work as lecturers in the other training institutes.
- (2) An annual grant, being subsidy towards the pay of the Manager-cum-Associate Editor of the Madras Journal of Co-operation, is paid to the State Co-operative Union. This amount also is based on the actual cost of the Manager-cum-Associate Editor. A sum of Rs. 3,750 was paid to the Union for 1951-52.

Annual grants are not given to the Tamilnad Co-operative Federation, and Andhra Desa Co-operative Union."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—" ఈ మదరాసు స్టేటు కో-ఆపరేటివ్ యూనియనుకు యిచ్చేటటువంటి గ్రాంటు విషయములో ప్రభుత్వ విధానాన్ని అమలు జరుపు ఓకు యిచ్చిందా ? లేక వారు స్వతంత్రంగా నివహించుకోవడానికా ? లేక అందరి ఉపయోగానికి యిచ్చిందా; అలాగైతే, రాజమండ్రి లెండ్రబేజ్ సహకారి సమ్మేళనకు ఎందుకని యివ్వడము లేదు."

[4th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ ఈ మదరాసు కో-ఆపరేటివ్ యూనియను మదరాసు రాష్ట్రములో సహకార ఉద్యమాన్ని ప్రచారం చేస్తున్నది. కాబట్టి ప్రత్యేకంగా తమిళదేశానికి, ఆంధ్రదేశానికి అని యివ్వడం లేదు.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఏ భాషలో ప్రచురింపబడితాయండి ? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ అవి ఆంగ్లములోనే ప్రచురింపబడుతవి.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“ Is there a Co-operative Union for Malabar? If there is not one, will the Government consider the desirability of starting one? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ I cannot answer at the moment. If the hon. Member gives me notice, I will.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ The Hon. Minister stated that the journal was being conducted only in the English language. In view of the fact that the aim of the co-operative movement is to spread the movement so that it could reach the illiterate masses in the villages, will the Hon. Minister consider the desirability of publishing the journal in the different regional languages? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ There are journals both in Tamil and in Telugu, Sir.”

A new bus-route on the Tirurkkad-Anakkayam road, Malabar district.

* 41 Q.—**JANAB KUNHI MUHAMED SHAFEE :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representations were made to Government to sanction a route for a new bus service on the Tirurkkad-Anakkayam road in Malabar district; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) & (b) There was no representation and there was no proposal to start a bus service on the Tirurkkad-Anakkayam road. But there was a representation and a proposal for introduction of a new bus route from Pattambi to Anakkayam *via* Perintalmanna and Tirurkkad and it was rejected by the Road Traffic Board as the road was supposed to be unfit for lorry traffic. This was the position on the 29th February 1952. On 31st August 1952, the Malabar Trade Union Council represented to Government that they wanted a new bus route from Anakkayam to Perintalmanna. The remarks of the Central Road Traffic Board are awaited in this matter.”

JANAB KUNHI MUHAMED SHAFEE :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Government are aware that a bus route was sanctioned between Perintalmanna and Anakkayam and that buses were plying for some months? ”

4th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ It is, so far as I am aware, a new bus route and the matter is being examined by the Central Road Traffic Board as to whether the road is fit and the bridges are safe.”

Direct recruitment of Deputy Collectors.

* 42 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether there is any proposal with the Government to abolish the present system of direct recruitment for Deputy Collectors?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ No.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—“ అను, వక్క తెలియని పిల్లకాయలను పెద్దపెద్ద ఉద్యోగస్తులగా ప్రభుత్వంవారు నియమిస్తున్నారు. అందువల్ల కోర్టులలో న్యాయం జరిగడంలేదు. అట్టలు అర్థంచేసుకొనలేకపోతున్నారు. అనుభవము వున్నవారు కనబడటంలేదు. చాలామంది అనుభవము, తెలివితేటలుగల ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు పైకి రావడానికి వీలుకాకుండా చేస్తున్నారు. కాబట్టి యీవిధంగాకాకుండా మరేమైనా మార్పుచేస్తారా? అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ నోటీసు యివ్వాలి.”

JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—“ Sir, many Deputy Collectors in service are direct recruits. May I ask, Sir, whether it is not advisable for the Government to stop direct recruitment for a period of two years and give a chance to those who are already in service? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The Government have now decided to recruit one directly and two by promotion.”

Weavers' Co-operative Societies and the exemption from the levy of audit fees.

* 43 Q.—SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state whether the Government are in receipt of the resolution recently passed at the meeting of the general body of the Madras State Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society, Limited, Madras, requesting the Government to exempt the Weavers' Co-operative Societies from the levy of audit fees at least for the year 1951-52, and if so, the action taken thereon by the Government?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ The Government have since perused the resolution and it is under examination.”

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—“ Sir, pending the decision in the matter, will the Government direct the head of the Co-operative Department to stop collection of audit fees for the year 1951-52 from the Weavers' Co-operatives? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ If the Government decide accordingly, they would certainly instruct the Registrar to stop collection of audit fees.”

[4th November 1952]

Number of Weavers' Co-operative Societies formed exclusively for Harijans.

* 44 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state the number of Weavers' Co-operative Societies that are formed exclusively for the Harijans in the State?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ There are 64 Weavers' Co-operative Societies formed exclusively for Harijans in the State.”

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—“ Will the Government consider the question of organizing Weavers' Co-operative Societies exclusively for the Harijans in Proddatur and Jammalamadugu taluks in view of the large number of Harijan weavers in these two taluks? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ If any such proposal comes we will certainly consider.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“ How many such societies are functioning in the district of South Arcot? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

Collection of excess water-tax from the peasants of turmeric fields in Krishna Western Delta.

* 45 Q.—SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether twice the usual water-tax was collected for the year 1951-52 from the peasants of turmeric fields all along the West Bank Canal of Krishna river; and

(b) if so, why?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ (a) & (b) The turmeric ayacut in the Krishna Western Delta has been specified and the list of lands included in the turmeric ayacuts was published in the *Guntur District Gazette* on 20th June 1947. Only the usual water-rate is charged in the case of the lands included under the turmeric ayacut. In the case of other lands not included in the ayacut, penal water-rate ranging from $1\frac{1}{2}$ times to twice the usual water-rate is being charged for irrigation of turmeric. In Tenali taluk, cultivation of turmeric on poramboke lands in fasli 1361 was charged at twice the usual water-rate.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“ మంత్రిగారు ఇంతవరకు రెండు సార్లు నేనుగూడా సమాధానం ఇచ్చారు. కనుక నా ప్రశ్నను చాలా అర్థంచేసుకొని సమాధానం ఇస్తారని అనిపిస్తున్నది. ఆయనకట్టులో చేరిన వసువుతోటలకు నీరు అడిగితే దేశంబరులో సప్లయి చేయవలసిన చాక్లర్ లేదంటున్నారు. ఇవరిలో ఏమి మాత్రం నీటి లీఎవకు రెండురెట్లు వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. అసలు చాలాకాలంనుండి ఆయనకట్టులో చేరిన భూమికి కూడా నీరు సప్లయి అవుతున్నట్లున్నది. కనుక ఆ భూమిని ఆయనకట్టులో పెట్టే నేర్యుతారా? ”

4th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ A definite ayacut is reserved for turmeric cultivation. Regarding the question of extending the turmeric ayacut, if the hon. Member makes any specific representation it will be examined and looked into.”

Nutritive value of the diet supplied in jails.

* 46 Q.—**SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Health Department has examined and analysed the diet supplied in jails regarding its nutritive value; and

(b) if so, what its report is?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ (a) & (b) The Health Department has not examined and analysed the diet supplied in jails regarding its nutritive value. The jail diets, were however, analysed by the Director of King Institute, Guindy, in 1950 and he reported the approximate caloric values of the various kinds of diet given to prisoners, per day, to be as follows :—

1 Class I Rigorous imprisonment.	Vegetarian ..	3,820 calories.
2 Class I Do.	Non-vegetarian.	3,152 do.
3 Class I Do.	Undertrials..	3,031 do.
4 Class I Do.	Rice diet ..	2,763 do.
5 Class II Do.	Mixed diet ..	2,741 do.
6 Simple imprisonment.	..	2,418 do.

The Jail Reforms Committee which recently went into the question of the adequacy or otherwise of the various kinds of diet given to prisoners in jails, with reference to their nutritive value, has observed that the scales of diet prescribed for the prisoners of the different classes and for the convict patients in hospitals are generally satisfactory and adequate.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ ప్రభుత్వం వారు యిటీవల జైళ్లలో యిస్తున్న ట్రీ ఆహార పదార్థాలను పరిశీలించుటకు Director of Public Health గారిని నియమిస్తారా ?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ A separate question may be put, Sir.”

SRI B. SANKARAYYA :—“ జైళ్లలో బియ్యము మొదలగు యివర ఆహార పదార్థములు ఆన్లీ కలిసి 18 బెన్సుల వరికు యివ్వాలని రూపు ఖన్ననూ, అలా గన తెయ్యకుండా చాలా sub-jails లో కూడా పది బెన్సులు మాత్రమే యిస్తున్నారని మంత్రి గారికి తెలుసునా ?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ A separate question may be put, Sir.”

[4th November 1952]

Number of fishing tanks in Hosur Livestock Research Station.

* 48 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) how many tanks are attached to Hosur Livestock Research Station;

(b) whether the concerned authorities have taken steps to develop fisheries in the tanks in question; and whether the authorities at any time auctioned the tanks for fishing; and

(c) whether they are doing so now; and if not, what is happening to the fish in the tanks that are attached to the Research Station?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) Five tanks, viz., Kalkeri, Appa Reddi, Poonapalli, Jeegoor and a small portion of the foreshore of the Karnoor tank are attached to the Livestock Research Station, Hosur.

“(b) Yes.

“(c) Due to failure of monsoon during the last five years, most of the tanks were completely dry, on many occasions resulting in the loss of foundation stock of fish. During these periods whenever there were rains and there was water in the tanks a small number of fish was developed and they were caught when the tanks went dry and the fish thus collected were sold departmentally.”

Capital punishment in Pudukkottai Division.

* 49 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether there was no capital punishment in Pudukkottai State before merger;

(b) whether capital punishment was introduced in Pudukkottai after merger of Pudukkottai State with Madras State and the date of its introduction; and

(c) the number of executions from Pudukkottai State (Division) since the introduction of capital punishment in Pudukkottai Division of Tiruchirappalli district?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“(a) There was no capital punishment in Pudukkottai State before merger.

“(b) The laws of Madras State were made applicable to Pudukkottai with effect from 1st April 1949. Consequently capital punishment was not excluded with effect from the same date.

“(c) One.”

4th November 1952]

Transfer of foresters within a circle.

* 50 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether there are standing orders to transfer foresters from one division to another division and from one district to another district.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Under the Special Rules for the Madras Forest Subordinate Service, the Conservator of a Forest Circle is empowered to transfer foresters from one division to another within the Circle, which comprises of three or four districts.”

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—“ In view of the small salaries drawn by the foresters, will it not be advisable for the Government to pass standing orders restricting transfers within the district itself? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ The matter will be considered, Sir.”

11-30
a.m.

[Note. —An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—REQUEST FOR A DEBATE ON FAMINE AND FOOD CONDITIONS IN THE STATE.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I want to ask the Hon. Leader of the House whether he will be prepared to allot two days for the discussion of the famine and food conditions in this Province, in view of the very acute scarcity conditions, particularly in the dry areas of almost all the twenty-four districts.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I will consider the suggestion, Sir.”

III.—DISQUALIFICATION OF A MEMBER (SRI SAKA VENKATA RAO)—cont.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Another matter, Sir. Yesterday, I raised the matter regarding Sri Saka Venkata Rao. I believe an appeal to the Supreme Court does not operate as stay of the judgment of the High Court. May I request the Speaker that summons may be issued to him and that he may be allowed to participate in the proceedings of this House? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I want to remind hon. Members and the Leader of the Opposition of Article 192 of the Constitution. I have written to the Governor and I am awaiting his reply. If the hon. Member is sitting here in the House, he is doing so at his own risk and I cannot now prevent him from doing so.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I think it was after a reference to the High Court's judgment . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ But I have not received a copy of the judgment; I have not also received a reply from the Governor.”

[4th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Have not the Government taken care to get a copy of the judgment, Sir?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I have applied for a copy of the judgment, Sir; but I have not yet received it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There is no difficulty in the matter at all. There is the decision of the High Court, and the Election Commissioner wants to test it in the Supreme Court also, because it is a matter of principle that is involved. Leave has also been given by the High Court. What the Leader of the Opposition said is quite right, that the appeal does not act as stay by itself. The member can remain here until the matter is decided."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"But no summons has been issued to the Member."

MR. SPEAKER:—"As I said, I have not received a reply from the Governor, as to how the matter has been decided. Until I know definitely, how can I ask the office to issue summons?"

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"ప్రధాన మంత్రి గారినుండి సరియైన సమాధానముకొరకు ఆసంగతున్నాను. శాసనసభ్యుడైన సాకా వెంకట్రావుగారు తనయొక్క risk మీద శాసనసభలో కూర్చోవచ్చునని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చెప్పుతున్నారు. కాని యొక్క attendance register లో వారి పేరు వ్రాసి కొట్టివేసియున్నది. ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన ప్రకారం వెంకట్రావుగారి పేరు రిజిస్టరులో వ్రాయించినట్లయితే వారియొక్క risk మీద సభలో కూర్చోనటానికి సిద్ధంగా ఉన్నారు."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member put it in writing and send it on to me; I shall examine that."

IV.—GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION *RE* HANDLOOM INDUSTRY—*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER:—"The next item is the debate on the handloom industry. The hon. Member Sri Venkatajagga Rao will now continue his speech. I have reduced the time-limit for each Member to ten minutes."

* SRI R. VENKATA JAGGA RAO:—"అభ్యుదయ, మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము వారు చేసేత పారిశ్రామిక సమస్యయొక్క బాధ్యత యావత్తూ కూడా కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము పైననే ఉన్నట్లు, తమకు ఎవ్విధమైన బాధ్యత లేనట్లుగా కూర్చుని చూస్తూన్న దని నేను అంటున్నాను. ఎందుచేతనంటే తమ బాధ్యతకూడా మన రాష్ట్రముగా ఎంతైనా భుజిస్తుమకూడా వారు ఎవ్విధమైనటువంటి బాధ్యత తీసుకోకుండా ఉంటున్నారని నేను మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఎక్కడ అయితే, వివిధ ప్రాంతాలలోనైతే చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములు హెచ్చుగా పుంజున్నారో ఆయా ప్రాంతాలలో చేనేత సహకార సంఘాలు ఏర్పాటుచేయడానికి యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు వెనుకడుగు వేస్తున్నారని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. విప్రాంతాలలోనైతే చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములు హెచ్చుగా ఉన్నారో ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో తప్పకుండా చేనేత పారిశ్రామిక co-operative societies స్థాపించవలసిందిగా ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అంతేకాకుండా యిప్పటి పరిస్థితులను బట్టి చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములు co-operative societies లో

4th November 1952] [Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao]

share ధనము చెల్లించి ఓరుదార్లుగా చేరుటకు అవకాశము లేకుండా భిన్నాభి
ముఖి చేస్తున్నాను. వివేకవంతులైన యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమ చాల దుర్బల స్థితికి
వచ్చి చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులకు జీవనభృతి తగ్గిపోయినందువల్ల వారు share
ధనమును కట్టలేకుండా యున్నారు. అందుచేత ప్రభుత్వమువారి యీ share
ధనమును చెల్లించి యీ co-operative societies యొక్క లాభమును
పొందేటట్లుగా వారిని చేర్పించవలసిందిగా నేను హృదయపూర్వకముగా
ప్రభుత్వము వారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అసలు యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామిక సమస్య
పూర్తిగా తీర్చవలసినట్లు ముఖ్యంగా యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు వీరికి కేటాయిం
దలచిన వీరెలు, దోవతులు మొదలైనవివంటి వాటిని కేటాయించినంత మాత్రముననే
యీ పరిస్థితి తొలగదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా మన రాష్ట్రంలో నూటికి
ఎనిభేషమందిగల సామాన్య ప్రజానీకముయొక్క జీవనస్థాయి తగ్గింది అంటే యీ
ప్రజానీకముయొక్క కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిందని చెప్పక తప్పదు. అందువల్ల యీ
చేనేత సమస్య పూర్తిగా పైకితీసుకొని రావటానికి అవకాశనూలేకుండా ఉన్నదని
మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు వీరియొక్క జీవనస్థాయిని బాగుచేయడా
నికి ప్రయత్నించవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ జీవన స్థాయి
పెచ్చింపు చేయడానికి మన ప్రభుత్వము వ్యవసాయ సంస్కరణలను ప్రవేశ పెట్టవల
సిన అవసరమున్నది. అంటే, మన రాష్ట్రంలో పెద్దపెద్ద భూస్వాములవద్ద వందలకొద్ది
ఉన్నటువంటి ఎకరాల భూమిని తీసుకొని క్యవసాయకులీలకు, పేద రైతాంగానికి
అలాగా ముఖ్యంగా విచిత్రముకూడా భూమి లేనివారికియిచ్చి వ్యవసాయ సంస్కరణ
చేయవలెను. ఈ విధంగా ఈ పేద ప్రజానీకముయొక్క జీవనస్థాయిని పెంచినాడే
ఈ చేనేత కారికులయొక్క సమస్య తీర్చడానికి అవకాశము కల్పించగలరని మనవి
చేస్తున్నాను. ఎందుచేతనంటే రెండవ ప్రపంచ యుద్ధమునకుముందు ఈ చేనేత
కారి కులయొక్క స్థితిగతులకు ఈ యుద్ధానంతరము వారికి భిన్న స్థితిగతులకు
చాలా తేడా వచ్చియున్నది. ఆ రోజులలో ఒక్కొక్క చేనేత పారిశ్రామికుడు నెల
ఒకటింటికి సుమారు ముప్పది రూపాయలు తెచ్చుకుంటూ ఉన్నాడు. ఈ డబ్బుతో ఆ
రోజులలో తన కుటుంబ పోషణ సుఖముగా జరుపుకొనగలిగియున్నాడు. ఎందుచేతనంటే
అనాడు ధాన్యము బస్తా ఒకటింటికి అయిదు, అరు రూపాయలు ఖరీదుపెట్టి కొను
క్కిని మిగతా వైకముతో తన కుటుంబ ఖర్చులు భరించుకొనగలిగియున్నాడు. అటు
వంటిది ఈ యుద్ధము తరువరి ఈ రోజులలో ధాన్యము బస్తా ఒకటింటికి సుమారు
30 రూపాయలనుండి 35 రూపాయలవరకు పెరిగియున్నది. ఈ నాడు ఈ పారి
శ్రామికుడు తెచ్చుకున్న ముప్పది రూపాయలు ఒక్క వియ్యమునకు మాత్రమే ఖర్చు
అయితే తన కుటుంబమునకు కావలసిన యితర ఖర్చులు మెట్లు భరించగలడో ప్రభు
త్వమువారి గమనించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. అందుచేత ఈ చేనేత సమస్య పూర్తిగా
తీర్చవలసిన బాధ్యత ఈ ప్రభుత్వము వారిపై యున్నదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బా
ధ్యత వహించకుండా అది కేవలము కేంద్రప్రభుత్వముదే అయియున్నదని చెప్పడ
మనేది ఈ పేద ప్రజానీకాన్ని మధ్య పెట్టడముకన్న మరేమికాలేదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను.
అందుచేత ముఖ్యంగా ఈ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులు అందరికీ చేయతగినంత సహాయము
చేయుటకు ఈ ప్రభుత్వమువారి బాధ్యత వహించియడల మిగిలినవిషయములను కేంద్ర
ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుట న్యాయము అని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ చేనేత
వారికి ప్రభుత్వమువారు కేటాయించదలచిన వీరెలు, దోవతులు కేటాయించినంత
మాత్రాననే, ఈ సమస్య తీరుదు. వీరికి కావలసినంత నూలు సరఫరా చేయించవలసి
భ్రంతుంది. అంతేకాకుండా నూలు ధర నూటికి యాభైవంతులు తగ్గించి వీరిపై పైకే
యించిన యడల వీరు ఈ పరిశ్రమను వృద్ధికి తెచ్చుకొని జీవించగలరు. అంతేకాదు

[Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao] [4th November 1952]

వీరికి ధాన్యములను సరఫరా చేసే కంట్రీలు లేకుండుట వలన చూడవలెను. ఇటువంటి ధాన్యత మన మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వమువారి వహించి, మిగిలినటువంటి విషయములకు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరి విషయముల అందరు కలిసి కృషిచేయు అవసరము ఎంతైనా ఉన్నది. అందువల్ల ఈ బిల్లును తప్పకుండా ఆమోదించగలరని నా విశ్వాసము. యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు తెచ్చిన తీర్మానమును నేను మనస్ఫూర్తిగా బలపరుస్తూ యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రవేశపెట్టిన ఈ బిల్లులోని ముఖ్యద్దేశానికి నా ఆమోదాన్ని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు నాన్ని సమగ్రంగా చేయాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో కొన్ని సవరణలుకూడా ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. చేత పరిశ్రమ భారతదేశంలో అనాది సిద్ధంగా వస్తున్న కుటీర పరిశ్రమ. లక్షలాది ప్రజలకు ఇదే జీవనాధారముగా ఉండి ఉండినది. నేడు యీ పరిశ్రమ అత్యంత స్త్రోవ పరిస్థితులకు లోనుకావలసివచ్చింది. చేనేత కార్మికులు కడుపు చేతపట్టుకొని భయభయపడే వలసిన దుర్లభ సూచించింది. ఆంధ్రదేశంలో ఎక్కడ పేద కుటుంబాలవారికి జీవకోపాధి కల్పించే ఈ వృత్తి నేడు వినాశనాన్ని ఎదుర్కొంటోంది. ముఖ్యంగా రాయలసీమలో నేడు చేనేత పాల్త్రామికులు పడుతున్న యిబ్బందులు విమోచనానికి ఉన్నాయి. చిత్రూరు జిల్లాలోని కాళహస్తి, మనసలూరి, వాయిల్ పాడు తాలూకాలలోను, అనంతపురం జిల్లాలోని ధర్మవరం తాలూకాలలోను, కడప జిల్లా, పులివెందుల, జమ్మలమడుగు, రాజంపేట తాలూకాలలోని చేనేత ప్రజలు పడే బాధలు వర్ణించటానికి వారు రావలసివేదు. వారికి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం చేసిన మేల్కొమ్మి లేవు. సాంప్రదాయ సిద్ధంగా వస్తున్న ఈ పరిశ్రమ నేడు అధోగతిపాశానాంతం యీ నాటివరకూ ప్రభుత్వానికి కనువిప్పుకాలేదు. బిడ్డ ఒకవిధంగా ఈ ప్రస్తుత తీర్మానం శాసన సభ ఎదుటికి వచ్చింది. అది కొంతవరకు మెరుగైన సంతోషిస్తున్నాను. కరువుకాటకాలతో అలమటిస్తున్న రాయలసీమలోని ఈ వీధి ప్రజానీకం కొంతవరకైనా కోలుకోవాల్సివచ్చే ప్రభుత్వంవారు వారికి ఉదారంగా జీవనభృతి ఋణాలివ్వాలి. చాలినంత నూలు సరఫరాచేసి వారికి పనికల్పించాలి. ఆ నూలును తక్కువ ధరకు యివ్వాలి. అందుకు సబ్సిడీని యివ్వాలి. గ్రామ గ్రామాలలో ఉన్న చేనేత కార్మికులను ముసంఘటితపరిచి సహకార సంస్థల అందుబాటులోనికి తీసుకొనిరావాలి. వారి జీవితాలకు ఒకదారి, తెన్ను చూపించాలి. ప్రస్తుతం చేనేత కార్మికులు కో-ఆపరేటివ్ సొసైటీలకు వేరు ధనంకూడా పెల్లించుకోలేని అభివృద్ధి పరిస్థితిలో ఉన్నారు. ఈ పేర్ ధనాన్ని ప్రభుత్వమే వారికిగాను పెల్లించాలి. వారిసందర్భం సహకార సంఘాలలో సభ్యులనుగాచేసి తగినంతపని కల్పించి జీవనభృతిని సంపాదింపజేయటానికి వారికి అనుకూలం కలుగజేయాలి. ముఖ్యంగా చేనేత పరిశ్రమ ఈ దేశంలో బ్రతకాలంటే దానికి మిల్లు పోటీలేకుండా చేయాలి. యాంత్రికమైన మిల్లు పరిశ్రమ అనుగతంగా ఈ దేశంలో ఉన్న కుటీర పరిశ్రమను కబళించివేయకుండా చూడాలి.

11-40
a.m.

“చేనేత పరిశ్రమ దిగినాది పోతోందని ఒకవంక చెబుతున్న ఈ ప్రభుత్వం నేటికీ కూడా అప్పుకపు పన్నును ఆ పరిశ్రమపైరుద్దడం అన్యాయంకాదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. తాము చేయవలసిన పై సహాయకార్యాక్రమాన్ని చేయకపోవడంవలన కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వంయొక్క నిజాయితీ ఋణాభార కాదు. లక్షలాది ప్రజలు ఆ భార పడివున్న ఒక కుటీర పరిశ్రమ కొనపూపిగిలతో ఉన్నామనా దానిపైన పన్ను భారం తొలగించలేదంటే నిజంగా ఆత్మర్యపడవలనే వస్తోంది. ప్రభుత్వ నిజాయితీని శంకించవలసే వస్తోంది. ఈ పన్నును ఇప్పుడైనా రద్దు పరుస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.

4th November 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

యాధానంతరకాలంలో చేసిన పరిశ్రమ తిన్న చెబ్బనుంచి తట్టుకోవడం అంత నులునైన పనికాదు. ఈ అయిదా రేండ్లుగా చేసేత కార్మికులు కష్టాలుపడిపడి కడకు తమకున్న దంతా కూడా విక్రయించుకున్నారు. ఈ సాధువారికిని కొద్దిపాటి నూలుతో నైనా తయారుచేసిన వస్త్రం అప్పుడుపోక విపరీత దుస్థితిలో పడినారు.

“అంతేకాకుండా చేసేత పరిశ్రమను విదేశీ మిల్లు వస్త్ర వ్యాపార పోటీనుంచి రక్షించవలసిన బాధ్యత ఈ ప్రభుత్వంమీద వుంది. మన దేశంలోని ఇంగ్లీషు మిల్లు యజమానుల పాలసీని కేంద్రప్రభుత్వం అనుసరిస్తున్నది. వీరి పోటీనుండి చేసేత పరిశ్రమను రక్షించాలంటే చేపకేరీచ్చే మగ్గల నూలును తక్కువ ధరకు యివ్వాలి. ఇందుకై నూలుకు సబ్సిడీ యివ్వాలి. విదేశాలనుంచి కొచ్చు ధరలకు ప్రతిని ఖరీదైన నూలులను తెప్పించి వాటిని చేసేతపరిశ్రమ వేయరాదు మిల్లు యజమానులు నూలు ధరలను పెంచకుండా చూడాలి. ముఠకనూలును దేశవారీ ప్రతికొనే తయారు చేయాలనే నిబంధనను ఉంచాలి. ఒకవంక దేశీయ పరిశ్రమ దిగజారిపోతూవుంటే బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదుల ట్రైల మిల్లు పరిశ్రమలను ప్రోత్సహించడం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి తగినపని అని గుర్తుకులేవాలి. నూరు, నూటయ్యైదే సంచితవ్వాలి బ్రిటిష్ పరిపాలనలో మన దేశ చేసేత పరిశ్రమ ఎంతో చెబ్బింది. కాంగ్రెస్ వారు అధికారానికి వచ్చిన తరువాతనైనా దానికి అదరణ చూపబడుతుందని ఆశించిన వారికి అశాభంకావాలి.

“అంతేకాకుండా మన చేసేతవస్త్రం ఈనాడు అమెరికా, జపాన్, బ్రిటన్ వస్త్రాల పోటీకి తట్టుకోలేకుండా వుంది. ఎంతోకాలంగా చిన్నారు జిల్లా, కాళహస్తి, తాలూకాలో తయారుచేయబడే పట్టుమార్కు గుడ్డ వస్త్రాకాకు ఎగుమతి చేయబడు తూంది. ప్రస్తుతం జపాన్, అమెరికా, బ్రిటన్ వస్త్రంతో అచ్చట పోటీ సంగ విండుతున్న మన బట్టకు కొనుగోలు తగ్గిపోయింది. అలాగే బర్మాను మన రాష్ట్రం నుండి పంపబడుతుండేన చేతిగుడ్డల యెగుమతి కూడా పడిపోయినది. 1920 వ సంవత్సరంలో మన రాష్ట్రం నుంచి బర్మాకు ఎగుమతి అయిన చేతిగుడ్డలలో ప్రస్తుతం 40% బడుతున్న సరుకును బాల్మియాచిస్ట్ల యితే నూటికి 70 వ.తులు తగ్గిపోయిందని ఋజుపత్రమింది. ఈ విషయాన్ని మదరాసు ప్రభుత్వ ఎకనామిక్ ఎన్వైజర్ డాక్టర్ నటరాజుగారి అంగీకరించారు. ఈ విషయాలన్నీటినీ ప్రభుత్వం గమనించాలి. విదేశాలలో మన చేసేత వస్త్రం అప్పుడుపోటానికి అవసరమైన సదుపాయాలన్నీటినీ కలుగజేయాలని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి మదరాసు ప్రభుత్వం తెప్పవలసివుంది. అంతే కాకుండా విదేశ వస్త్రాల దిగుమతులనుకూడా అరికట్టవలసిన ఆగత్యం ఉంది.

“చేసేత వస్త్రానికి ప్రోత్సాహమివ్వటానికి ప్రభుత్వం హృదయపూర్వకంగా పని చేయాలి. ముందుగా ప్రభుత్వ శాఖలలో అవసరమైన వస్త్రాలు చేసేవిగానే వుండు నట్లు చూడాలి. ఇందువల్ల ఈనాడు ముగిరియివున్న చేసేత వస్త్రం విడుదల అవటమేకాక ఇతరులకూడా చేసేత వస్త్రాన్ని కొనుటకు ప్రోత్సాహం కలుగుతుంది. చేసేత బట్టలకు ఒక పెద్ద మార్కెట్టు తద్వారా జరుగుతుంది.

“చేసేత పరిశ్రమ అభివృద్ధి కావాలంటే, విదేశ వస్త్రాల పోటీకి తట్టుకోవాలంటే ఆ పరిశ్రమ యాంత్రికముగా అభివృద్ధి చెందవలసివుంది. తక్కువ ఖరీదుతో ఎక్కువ గుడ్డను ఉత్పత్తిచేసే విధముగా యంత్రం అభివృద్ధి చేయబడాలి. కార్మికుని సృజనాత్మక శక్తిని సక్రమంగా వినియోగించుకోవాలి. అతనికి సంకల్పపీకరమైన కూలి కొడుకునట్లు చూడాలి. అందుకుగాను ఒక ప్రత్యేక టెక్నికల్ కమిటీని ఏర్పాటు చేయాలి. ఈ విషయమై శ్రద్ధ తీసుకోవలసి ఉంది.

[4th November 1952

' Add the following at the end :—

- (a) to absorb all handloom weavers into co-operative societies, paying the share capital in famine-affected districts such as Chittoor, Cuddapah, Anantapur, etc.;
- (b) to abolish sales tax on the sales of handloom cloth;
- (c) to grant subsidies to this industry by subsidising the yarn price till it regains stability;
- (d) to ban all foreign imports of textile goods;
- (e) to use handloom cloth in all departments of the Government, so that the large stock may be consumed by the Government; and
- (f) to institute a technical committee to improve the productive capacity of the handloom industry at a lower cost."

“சென்ற தேர்தலில் காங்கிரஸ் பெருவாரியாகத் தோற்றதற்குக்காரணம் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய வயிற்றொரிச்சில் அரசாங்கம் கொட்டிக் கொண்டதுதான். அதன் காரணமாகத்தான் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் இந்த காங்கிரஸ் அரசாங்கத்தை எப்படியாவது மாற்றியமைக்கவேண்டுமென்று காங்கிரசுக்கு எதிர்ப்பாக வாக்களித்தார்கள் என்பது ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரிந்துதான் நெசவாளர்கள் கவனம் செலுத்தியிருப்பதாக நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

“இன்றையதினம் சேலத்திலிருந்தும், கோயமுத்தூரிலிருந்தும் குடும்பம் குடும்பமாக பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகின்ற கூட்டத்தைப் பார்க்கிறோம். ஊர் ஊராக பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிற கூட்டத்தார் யாராக இருக்க முடியுமென்று சிந்திக்கின்றபோது அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் தான் என்ற முடிவுக்கு வரவேண்டிய நிலைமையாக இருக்கிறது. அந்த நிலையில் குடும்பம் குடும்பமாக, ஊர் ஊராக பட்டினி ஊர்வலம் வந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்களே, அவர்கள் யார்? அவர்கள் தான் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள். அவர்கள் விஷயத்தில் கண்ணாங்குத்துமாக ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கக்கூடிய இந்த தீர்மானம் வரவேற்கத்தகுந்த விஷயம்.

4th November 1952] [Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

“கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு 40-ம் நெம்பர் வரையிலும் நெய்வதற்கு உரிமை கொடுத்தவிட்டால் போதாது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் விஷயத்தில் பல விஷயங்கள் கவனிக்கப்படவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஸ்ரீமான் முன்ஷி அவர்கள் சொன்ன உபதேசத்தை இன்றைய தினம் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் கடைப்பிடித்து வருகிறார்கள். அதாவது ஸ்ரீமான் முன்ஷி அவர்கள் மாடு தின்னும் புண்ணாக்கையும், பருத்திக்கொட்டையையும் மக்கள் சாப்பிட உபதேசம் செய்தார். புண்ணாக்குத் தீன்பவர்கள் யாராவது இருக்கின்றார் என்று சொன்னால் அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள்தான்.

“குறிப்பாக தென் ஆற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் என்னுடைய தொகுதியாகிய விக்ரவாண்டியில் ஏராளமான கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் புண்ணாக்கைத் தின்ன உண்ணவேண்டிய நிலையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு கிராமத்தில் மக்கள் ‘நாங்கள் நான்கு மூட்டை புண்ணாக்கு தின்றோம்’, இன்னொரு கிராமத்தில் ‘நாங்கள் ஐந்து மூட்டை புண்ணாக்கு தின்றோம்’ என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்வதைக் கேட்கிறோம். இந்த நிலைமைக்குக் காரணம் என்னவென்றால், என் தொகுதியில் அரிசி கிடையாது, சோளம் கிடையாது என்ற நிலை இருக்கிறது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் பட்டினியாக இருந்து கொண்டு எப்படி துணி நெய்யமுடியும்? உணவுப் பஞ்சத்தை முதலில் நீக்கவேண்டும். அடுத்தபடியாக, நெய்வதற்கு உரிமை கொடுத்துவிட்டால் மட்டும் போதாது. நம் நாட்டில் விநியோகசூடிய பஞ்சானது வெளிநாட்டுக்குப் போகாமல் தடுக்கவேண்டும். வடநாட்டிலிருந்து தென்னாட்டுக்கு இறக்குமதியாகும் பம்பாய், ஆமதாபாத், மில் துணிகள் வராமல் தடுக்கவேண்டும். அப்படி வடநாட்டிலிருந்து மில் துணிகள் இங்கு வருமேயானால், அதற்குப் பணம் கொடுப்பதற்குப் பதிலாக கைத்தறி துணிகளையே நாம் திருப்பி அந்த வடநாட்டுக்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்ற விஷயத்தை வலியுறுத்திக் கூற விரும்புகிறேன்.

“மேலும், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் மாதம் முப்பது நாட்களுக்கு வேலை 11-50 செய்வதற்குப் போதிய வேலையில்லை. வேலைக்குத் தகுந்த கூலியும் அவர்கள் களுக்குக் கிடைப்பதில்லை. இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருப்பது அவர்களை கண்களைத் துடைப்பதுபோல் இல்லாமல் உண்மையாகவே அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்களைப் போக்குவதற்குவேண்டிய வழிவகைகளைச் செய்வது அரசாங்கத்தின் கடமை. மில் துணி குறைந்த விலைக்குக் கிடைக்கிறது, அழகாகவும் இருக்கிறது. ஆகையினால் மக்களுக்கு மில் துணிகளின்மீது கண்ணாட்டம் பேசுகிறது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குணங்களை உண்மையிலேயே திரைக்கவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தோடு இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை அரசாங்கம் கொண்டுவந்திருக்குமேயானால், இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை அமல் நடத்துவதற்கு உண்மையிலேயே நல்ல அபிப்பிராயம் அவர்களுக்கு இருக்குமேயானால் அரசாங்கம் கைத்தறித் துணிகளுக்கென்றே நூலின் விலையைக் குறைக்கவேண்டும். கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய நிலைமையை உயர்த்தவேண்டும். கைத்தறித் துணியின் விலையைக் குறைத்தால் தான் எல்லா மக்களும் வாங்குவார்கள்.

“காந்தியின் திட்டங்களிலேயே மிக முக்கியமானது கதர் திட்டம். எல்லோரும் கதரைத்தான் கட்டவேண்டும் என்று உபதேசம் செய்துவந்தது போல கைத்தறித் துணியைத் தவிர வேறு துணியை கட்டக்கூடாதென்றும் அரசாங்க உத்தியோகத்திலிருக்கக்கூடிய கீழ்த்தர சிப்பந்திகளுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படும் துணி கைத்தறித் துணியாகத்தான் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் வற்புறுத்தி ஒரு உத்தரவு போடலாம்.

“அந்த நிலையில், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கை நிலையை உயர்த்தவேண்டியது அவசியம். கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய நிலைமை உயர்ந்தால்தான் நாடு உயரும். ஆகவே, அவர்கள் விஷயத்தில் கண்ணாங்குருத்தமாக இருக்கவேண்டும். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்து நிறைவேற்றிவிட்டால் மட்டும் போதாது.

“இந்த நாட்டிலிருந்து வடநாட்டுக்குப் போயிருக்கிற டி.டி.கே. அவர்கள் நம் நாட்டை அடகு காட்டி ராஜாஜி அவர்களை எதிர்த்துப்போராடுகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் மனப்பான்மையைத் திருத்தவேண்டியது ராஜாஜி அவர்களுடைய

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar] [4th November 1952]

கடமையாக இருக்கின்றது. ஆகவே, டி.டி.கே. போன்றவர்களுக்கு மில் முதலாளிகளுடன் தொடர்பு இருக்கமுடியும். ஆனால், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் அதிகமாக வாழ்கின்ற பிராந்தியத்தைச் சேர்ந்த சேலத்திலிருந்து ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் வந்திருக்கின்ற காரணத்தினால் சேலத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குறையையும் தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குறையையும் போக்க வேண்டியது சர்க்காரின் கடமை. அவர்கள் வேலையில்லாமல் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள்.

“ பஞ்சத்தால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் ஸ்ரீமான் மாணிக்கவேலு நாயக்கர் சுற்றுப்பிரயாணம் செய்தபோது செஞ்சிக்கும் வந்திருந்தார். அவருடைய கூட்டத்திற்கு ஜனங்களை எப்படிக்கூட்டினார்கள் தெரியுமா? ‘ பெண்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் சேலக் கஷ்டத்தைப்போக்க மந்திரி அவர்கள் வந்திருக்கின்றார்கள்’ என்று ஊர் ஊராகச் சென்று கூப்பிட்டார்கள். அதை நம்பி அரை நிர்மாணமாக துணியில்லாமல் பெண்கள் ஓடிவந்தார்கள். கட்டத்துணி இல்லையென்று அப்பொழுது கதறி விட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் பிணைக்கைத்தின்று வயிறு உப்பிவிடுகிறது என்று மந்திரியிடம் முறையிட்டனர். மேலும் கட்டத் துணியில்லாமல் என்ன செய்யமுடியும்? இந்தப் பஞ்சத்தை அவர்கள் எப்படித் தீர்க்கப் போகிறார்கள் என்று தெரியவில்லை. பஞ்சத்தால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் அத்தனை பேர்களும் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள்தான். அவர்களில் அனேகமாக பருத்தி உற்பத்தி செய்கின்றவர்களும் இருக்கின்றார்கள். நம்முடைய நாட்டுக்காகவே நாங்கள் ஒவ்வொரு காரியமும் செய்து வருகிறோம், ஒவ்வொருவரும் நாட்டுக்காக உழைக்கவேண்டுமென்று உபதேசம் எந்த தேச பக்தர்கள் செய்தார்களோ அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது அதைச் செய்ய வேண்டிய காலம் வந்துவிட்டது. ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களின் குறைகளை அறவே போக்கி அவர்களுக்கு நல்லது செய்வார்களே யானால் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய கெட்ட பெயர் நங்கும் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பேச்சை இத்துடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the Government not only on behalf of the handloom weavers, but also on behalf of the people of this State on having tabled a resolution favouring the reservation of dhoties and sarees exclusively for the handloom industry, particularly at this opportune time. Sir, this resolution has given an opportunity for this House to express its opinion regarding the future of the handloom as well as the textile mill industry in the country and it is also providing a rare opportunity to the people of this State to understand the merits of the case of the handloom weavers.

“ The resolution raises several fundamental issues including firstly, whether there is competition between the mills and the handlooms; secondly, whether the handloom industry requires protection against the competition of the textile mills, if it is admitted that competition exists between the mills and the handlooms; thirdly, what shall be the nature and form of protection to be given to the handloom industry; and fourthly, what will be the effects of providing protection to the handloom industry on the textile mills and also on the consuming public.

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“ Sir, coming to the issue of competition between the textile mills and the handlooms, it is an admitted fact that there is keen

4th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

competition between them. Handlooms in ancient times were supplying the entire clothing requirements of the country; but to-day they are not allowed to produce even one-third of the entire clothing requirements of the country, because of the fundamental change in the structure of the handloom industry. Formerly, handloom weavers were getting yarn from every family, to which they were returning the cloth in turn; but to-day they are made entirely to depend upon the textile mills for their main raw material, viz., yarn. By taking this advantage of the entire dependence of the handlooms for yarn on the mills, the mills, with the active help, continuous support and protection of the Government, have encroached into the field of cloth production and have to-day covered two-thirds of the total production of cloth in the country. Thus, the textile mill industry has deprived millions of handloom weavers of their ancient hereditary and honest profession. Now, what more proof is necessary to show that the textile mills are not only competing with the handlooms, but also contemplating the complete extinction of the handlooms? In fact, the competition between the textile mills and the handlooms was long ago admitted. In this connexion, I wish to quote the findings of the Tariff Board appointed in the year 1932. The Tariff Board in their report on the cotton industry in 1932 wrote that 'the mills for whose assistance duties were levied, have benefited more from them and therefore have become better able to fight the handloom industry.'

'At a later stage, the Government of India in their resolution, dated the 25th January 1941, appointing a Fact Finding Committee (Handlooms and Mills) stated—

12
noon.

'The problem of safeguarding the position of the handloom industry and at the same time reconciling the conflicting interests of the handloom and the mill industries has been under the consideration of the Government of India for the last few years and has been raised more than once at the industries conferences.'

They have also asked the Fact Finding Committee 'to compare the nature of the products of the handloom industry in each area surveyed with the corresponding mill products and to find the nature of the competition between the two. The Fact Finding Committee found out that there was competition between textile mills and the handloom industry and definitely stated—

'In sarees, competition is most serious in counts 20s to 40s. Even in higher counts there has lately grown powerful mill competition. In the case of choties also direct mill competition is in respect of medium counts and in gunghas, chaddars, shirrings and coatings also mill competition of a serious nature has developed.'

In the year 1949, the Government of India appointed a Standing Handloom Committee to go into the question of the competition of textile mills with handlooms and to suggest measures for the effective protection of the handlooms against the competition of the mills. The Committee in their resolution stated—

'The Committee are emphatically of the opinion that it is necessary to afford to the handloom industry a permanent measure of protection—

(a) by the imposition of an excise duty on the products of the mill industry; and

(b) by the reservation of a suitable field of production for the handloom industry.'

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

[4th November 1952]

Finally in the year 1949, the Government of India appointed a sub-committee but unfortunately with a predominant representation to the textile mills, to go into the question of reserving certain fields of production of textiles exclusively for the handloom industry. The principle of reserving certain fields of production of cloth for the handloom industry has been accepted by the Sub-Committee, and the Government in accordance with the Committee's recommendation have reserved certain varieties of cloth exclusively for the handloom industry. But that was a nominal reservation because most of the varieties reserved for the handloom industry were already the complete monopoly of the handloom industry and therefore, the handloom industry could not derive any material benefit from the reservation which was made in 1949 and hence the need to extend the field of reservation to the handloom industry.

"Coming to the issue why the handloom industry requires protection against the mill competition, I would like to say, that if the mills in the country had confined themselves mainly to spinning as they did in the past, the question of giving protection to the handloom industry would not have arisen at all. But they did not rest content with spinning alone and they have taken up weaving of cloth and have captured a larger portion of the internal cloth market and have thus deprived the handloom weavers of their honest means of livelihood. So, there is an urgent need for providing protection to the handloom industry. It is an admitted fact that still two crores of people are clinging on to the handloom industry in the fond hope, that the Government would not before long give them adequate protection against the competition of the mills. It is, therefore, for the Government to consider how long they can afford to neglect their duty towards the suffering millions of handloom weavers in the country. The mere supply of yarn to the handloom weavers cannot solve their problems. The Government must secure a stable and an assured market for the handloom products and with that purpose in view, they will have to reserve certain fields of production of textiles for them. There are two more important considerations for giving protection to handloom industry. One is that the handloom industry can absorb many more unemployed people besides the 20 millions who are already engaged in it and secondly, it eliminates the conflict between capital and labour and also banishes the growth of the present Communist trends which is but the necessary consequence of the exploitation of labour by capital. The handloom weavers therefore have every right to demand from their Government to safeguard their industry against the competition of the mills. Because the mechanical set-up of the powerlooms in the mills, which can conveniently work with more than two treadles and two healds, is best suited for production of twills, drills, satins and similar other varieties, the handloom weavers are urging that the production of dhoties and sarees should be reserved to them. The mechanical set-up of the handloom, which generally works with two healds, is best suited for the production of the dhoties and sarees. There is no use in asking weavers to produce what they

4th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

cannot produce. I would like, in this connexion, to make a few remarks on the statements made by mill-owners on the question of the reservation of dhoties and sarees to the handloom industry. They tried to scare away the public by telling them that the handlooms cannot produce the required quantity of sarees and dhoties and the price of the handloom cloth will be prohibitive. With regard to the production capacity of the handlooms from my own experience I can say, that from 7 to 8 yards of cloth can be easily produced in a working day of eight hours on a single loom and on this basis 2,000 yards can be produced on a single loom in a year and if we take into account the fact that 29 lakhs of looms are working in the country, they can easily produce 5,800 millions of yards of cloth provided the Government make the mills to afford a plentiful supply of yarn for the handlooms at reasonably reduced rates. With regard to the cost of production of cloth by handlooms, the propaganda of the textile mills is not only incorrect but also misleading. It is an admitted fact that the handloom weaver is paying 25 per cent extra over the cost price of the yarn and it is not therefore the fault of the weaver if his cloth costs more and is 5 to 10 per cent higher than the price of a similar cloth produced by the mills. Far from that, it proves that the cost of production of handloom cloth is cheaper than the cost of production of cloth in mills.

“ Sir, in this connexion I wish to quote a relevant portion from the memorandum submitted by the Madras Provincial Handloom Weavers' Congress, Nidubrolu, to the Prime Minister of India on 1st April 1950, about the high costings of cloth in mills—

12-10
p.m.

“ As per the costings given by the Textile Commissioner, Government of India, Bombay, in his No. TCSI/CYC-OP, dated the 27th January 1950, the ultimate cost of production of cloth in mills ranges between 6 and 7 annas and even more in some cases per a knot (8,400 yards) of yarn. The lay man knows and calculates only the cost of the actual weaving on the speedy power loom. He does not know how much more the mills will have to spend in the form of (a) interest on capital, (b) depreciation on machinery, buildings and fixtures (c) Insurance charges, (d) Fuel or power charges, (e) Taxes, (f) Establishment including labour and cost of management, (g) advertisement and other trade charges. When the cumulative effect of all these items is taken into account the ordinary man will be surprised to know that a yard of even plain cloth is now produced on a handloom at less cost than on a power loom in a mill. This feature explains why less efficient mills are given additional margins of profit by permitting them to sell their products direct to consumers.”

“ I also wish to point out that the newly-started textile mills are being given adequate protection against the competition of the efficient mills. Firstly, they are exempted from the levy of all taxes. Secondly, they are allowed to sell their products directly to the consumers, thus allowing them to make a profit of more than 6½ per cent an efficient mill can earn.

“ Sir, the Bombay Mill Owners' Association have also suggested that the handlooms should confine themselves to the production of artistic and costly cloth required by the richer classes of the people. It is a fact that some of the handlooms had and have been confining themselves to the production of artistic and costly fabrics required by the richer classes of people, but the percentage of the costly and artistic fabrics formed about 2 to 3 per cent of the total

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah] [4th November 1952]

production of the handloom cloth. Therefore, they cannot afford any adequate protection to all the 29 lakhs looms working in the country. The secret in the suggestion of the mill-owners, is that mills with their mechanical set-ups, are not suitable for producing any artistic or costly fabrics.

" With regard to the distribution of yarn, it was stated in the resolution, that adequate quantities of yarn should be made available to the handloom industry. But I want to make it clear that, under the existing distribution scheme brought into force in the year 1945, the composite and the weaving mills are allowed to draw their requirements in full as a first charge on the total production of yarn and the balance is first shared by hosiery knitting factories, the fishermen, and other miscellaneous consumers, and the balance if any left is being distributed among the handloom weavers. I, therefore, like to stress that Government should see that the handloom industry gets adequate quantity of yarn from the mills, and for this purpose they must see that the full requirements of the handloom industry shall be met as a first charge on the total production of yarn in that country. That is the only solution for getting adequate quantities of yarn for the handloom industry.

" With regard to prices, both the Government and the mills have done great harm to the handloom industry. Though the price of cotton has been going down from the beginning of this year, the Government have been trying to maintain a high level of yarn prices to the best advantage of the mills and to the detriment of the handloom industry. In fact when the price of cotton per candy was Rs. 250 on 30th June 1939, the price of the following counts of yarn was as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.	
20s	3	12	0	per 10 lb.
40s	5	4	0	Do.
60s	7	6	0	Do.
80s	11	2	0	Do.

Now, the cost of cotton per candy is about Rs. 700 and the cost of yarn is as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.		
20s	19	0	0	per 10 lb.	
40s	24	10	6	Do.	(If spun out of Indian cotton.)
	44	14	0	Do.	(If spun out of admixture of foreign cotton.)
60s	57	4	6	Do.	
80s	72	15	6	Do.	

This clearly indicates that there is no relation between the actual cost of cotton and the ex-mill price of yarn. Therefore, there is the imperative need to reduce the price of yarn at least in proportion to the fall in prices of cotton.

4th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

"Sir, I wish to say a few words about control on cotton. At present, the Indian cotton is the cheapest cotton. In the world market, the price of cotton per candy is not less than Rs. 1,700. But here the price of Indian cotton per candy is about Rs. 700 only. Therefore, the mills are exporting Indian cotton to foreign countries to fetch more profits and importing cotton into the country and dumping finer counts of yarn with high prices on the handloom industry. Also, the quantity of coarse yarn produced in the country is being exported to countries like Ceylon, Burma, Siam where hitherto handloom cloth was being sold. Thus the mills are making profits by exporting cheap cotton and yarn and, at the same time, they are dumping high-priced yarn on the handloom weavers. The matter must be looked into and the Government should see that yarn at a reasonable price is made available to the handloom industry."

* DR. T. S. SOUNDARAM RAMACHANDRAN :— "கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தக் கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலானது, உணவு மனிதனுக்கு எப்படி அவசியமோ அதேபோல் இதுவும் அவசியம் என்று உணர்ந்து இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இது ஒரு ஜீவாதாரத் தொழில் என் னது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். இந்த சமயத்தில் கைத்தறி நெசவுக்குப் பேர்போன ரம்முடைய சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் இந்தக் கிளர்ச்சியை உண்டு பண்ணினது ரொம்ப நியாயம். இதை சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலி ருந்தே கொண்டு வந்து, கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு வேலை கொடுப்பதற்கும், அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத்தரம் உயர்வதற்கும், அவர்கள் நன்றாக காலட்சேபம் பண்ணுவதற்கும் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை இந்த சட்ட சபையில் இந்த நேரத்தில் கொண்டு வந்தது ரொம்பவும் பொருத்தமானது. இதில் அவசியமான குழப்பத்தைப் புகுத்தி கருத்து வேற்றுமைகளையும், மன வேற்றுமைகளையும் கொண்டு வராமல் இதை ஏக மனதாக நிறைவேற்றினால் பெருமைக்கு உகந்ததாக இருக்கும்.

"இந்த சமயத்தில் இதைப் பற்றி இன்னும் சில விஷயங்களைச் சொல்ல 12-20 விரும்புகிறேன். புள்ளி விவரங்களைப் பற்றி எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். p.m. அதைப் பற்றி அதிகமாகச் சொல்ல வேண்டியதில்லை. ஆனால் நாம் எந்த மனப்பான்மையுடன், எந்த லட்சியத்துடன் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றவேண்டுமென்கிறதைப் பற்றி ஒன்றிரண்டு விஷயங்களை மட்டில் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். நமக்கு முன்னால் எதிர்காலத்தில் பயங்கரமான பஞ்ச காலம் இருக்கிறது. மனிதனுக்கு உணவும், உடையும் வேண்டும் என்பது மட்டும் அல்ல, இப்பொழுது திராத வேலையில்லா திண்டாட்டம் என்ற பிரச்சனையை எவ்வளவு தராம் சமாளிக்கப் போகிறோம் என்ற ஒரு மகத்தான பிரச்சனை இருக்கிறது. அதை நீக்கவதற்கு என்ன இருக்கிறது என்பதை ஆலோசிக்கும்படி, என்னுடைய சகாப்திகளை நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்த விஷயத்தில் அவசியத்திற்கும் மேலான அதிகப்படியான ஜனங்களுக்கு வாழ்க்கைக்கு வேண்டியதை மட்டும் கொடுக்க முடியாது. குடிசைத் தொழிலுக்கு அதிகமான மூலதனம் இல்லாத ஏழை மக்களுக்கு வருவாய் கிடைக்கக் கூடிய தொழில் இந்தக் கைத்தொழில் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். இந்தக் குடிசைத் தொழில் ரொம்பவும் புராதனமானது, இதில்தேர்ச்சி பெற்ற கோடிக் கணக்கான நெசவாளர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். யாதொரு மூலதனமும் இல்லாத வெறும் கருவிகளைக் கொண்டுள்ள தொழிலில் ஒன்று இருக்கிறது என்றால் அது இந்தக் கைத்தறித் தொழில் தான். இதை நாம் ஆதரிக்கும் முன் இதையொட்டி ஒன்றிரண்டு விஷயங்களை மனதில் வைத்தக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதற்கும் ஒரு தேவை வரும் என்பதை ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்தக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். இப்பொழுது கைத்தறி தொழில் எப்படி லட்சக் கணக்கான மக்களுக்கும், குடும்பங்களுக்கும் வாழ்க்கை வசதி அளிக்கிறதோ அதைப் போலவே கடரும் அளிக்கிறது என்பதை இந்த சமயத்தில் குறிப்பிடாமல் இருக்க முடியாது. கடற் நெசவு என்று

[Dr. T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran] [4th November 1952]

சொல்லும்போது கையால் நூற்கிற நூலைக் கையால் நெசவு பண்ணுவது என்பதாகும். ஸ்திரீகள் வேலையில்லாத நேரங்களில் நூற்பது மூலமாக கொஞ்சம் ஒன்றிரண்டு ரூபாய் வந்தால் அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கை வளம் பெறச் செய்யும். கைத்தறியை ஆதரிக்க வேண்டுமென்றும் ஜனங்களுக்கு உற்சாகம் ஏற்படுத்துவதன் பொருட்டும் அதற்கு திட்டங்கள் போடும்போது நீங்கள் கதரை மறந்து விடக்கூடாது என்றும் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இது ஒரு சிறந்த பிரச்சனை என்பதற்காக அதைப் பற்றி சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன்.

“குடிசைத் தொழிலை நாம் ஆதரிக்கவேண்டியதோடு மட்டுமல்லாமல் சீக்கிரத்திலேயே அதை சீர்படுத்த ஒரு காலம் வரும். ஆகவே இந்தக் கைத்தறித் தொழிலை எல்லோரும் ஒருமுகமாக ஆதரிக்க வேண்டும். அதனால் இந்த வேலையில்லா திண்டாட்டம் ஒழியவேண்டும். இந்த நெருக்கடி காலத்தில் ஜனங்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைக்கு வழி செய்யவேண்டும். இதில் கருத்து வேற்றுமை இல்லாது ஒரே மனப்பான்மையுடன் இதை ஆதரித்து சர்க்கார் கையை பலப்படுத்தி இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றி வைக்க வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

SRI M. HANUMANATHA RAO :—“கொஞ்சம், ఈ లీక్చరుని నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. అయితే, ఇదే సమయంలో ఈ లీక్చరునల్ల, దీని సమస్యలని కొన్ని పద్ధతులు అమలు జరుపుకుంటే ఈ సమస్య పూర్తిగా పరిష్కారమవుతుందని అనుకోవడం చాలా ప్రయత్నం దాని లీనినవలసిందని నేను హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. ఈ లీక్చరుని అనుసరించి, దీనితోపాటు ఇంకా కొన్ని పర్యలు ప్రభుత్వం లీసుకొంటేనే తప్ప ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికుల సమస్య పూర్తిగా పరిష్కారం కాదు, అనేటటువంటి విషయము ప్రభుత్వం గుర్తించాలని చెప్పేసికొండ నేను ఈ సందర్భంలో హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. ఈ లీక్చరులో stable అనే పదము వాడబడింది. అయితే ఆ పదము ఆ విధంగా వాడబడడం అనేది ఒక ప్రయత్నం దాని లీనింది. కాని ఇది శాశ్వత పరిష్కార మార్గము కాదు. ఇప్పుడు చేయుచున్నటువంటి కార్యము తాత్కాలిక ఉపశాంతి మాత్రమే. దీని సమస్యలని పరిష్కరించు పర్యలు లీసుకొంటేనే తప్ప ఈ సమస్య పూర్తిగా, శాశ్వతముగా పరిష్కారము కాదని నేను నొక్కి చెప్పవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. అందుచేత ఈ హెచ్చరికను ప్రభుత్వము ప్రత్యేకముగా గమనింపవలసియున్నది. ఈ రోజున చేనేత కార్మికులందరూ ఈ విధంగా అవస్థపడుతున్న పేద జనము అనేకమంది, లక్షలకొలది, కోట్లకొలది మన దేశములో ఉన్నారు. కాని వారిందరిని గుర్తించినా, గుర్తించకపోయినా, ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికులైనా ఎక్కువ కష్టపడుతున్నారని, చాలా ఇబ్బందులకు లోబడి అనేక అవస్థలు పడుతున్నారని ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించినందుకు సంతోషిస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా చేనేత పార్టీశామికుల పరిస్థితి చాలా అధ్వాన్నముగా ఉన్నదనే విషయాన్ని నొక్కి చెప్పవలసిన అవసరము లేదు. దీన్ని గురించి ఇదివరకు అనేకమంది గౌరవనీయ సభ్యులు చెప్పారు. ఒక సంవత్సరం క్రితము ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికులు పొందుతున్న మజూరి దాదాపు రూ 1-4-0 ల వరకు ఉండగా, ఈ రోజున సానైటీలలోగూడ చేనేత పార్టీశామికులు పొందుతున్న మజూరి 0-8-0 మాత్రమే అయివున్నది. అయితే, ఈనాడు, ధాన్యము ధర, బియ్యము ధర కూస్తే, ఇదివరకు అసగా సంవత్సరము క్రితముకంటే ఇప్పుడు దాదాపు రెట్టింపు పెరిగిపోయినదనే విషయము అందరికీ తెలిసినదే. అటువంటిప్పుడు, ముందు ఇచ్చిన 1-4-0 మజూరిని ఇప్పుడు 0-8-0 కి తగ్గించారంటే, ఇక ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికులు పడుతున్న ఇబ్బందులు ఎంత ఎక్కువగా ఉన్నవో, దాన్ని గురించి ప్రత్యేకముగా చెప్పవలసినటువంటి పనిలేదు. కనుక ఈవిధంగా అనేక అవస్థలు పడుచూ దారుణమైనటువంటి కడవుకు గరి అయినటువంటి ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికుల యొక్క పరిస్థితి కాగనోయడము కోసరము ఏ ఒక్క చిన్న పనిచేసినప్పటికీ, దానిని

4th November 1952] [Sri M. Hanumantha Rao]

అధిపతిని పంపించియుంటుంది. అందుకనే ఈ లిక్కానాన్ని బలపరచున్నాను. ఇదే సందర్భంలోనే దీనికి కొన్ని సవరణలు కూడా ప్రతిపాదించబడినవి. ఆ సవరణలను అంగీకరించినప్పుడే ప్రభుత్వము హృదయపూర్వకముగా ఈ సమస్యను పరిష్కరించుటకు పూనుకొన్నదని చెప్పడానికి వీలు ఆవుతుంది. ముఖ్యంగా విదేశ వస్త్రముల దిగుమతిపై, విదేశీ పోటీపై మన దేశపు వస్త్ర పరిశ్రమ పై దెబ్బపడుతున్నదనే విషయాన్ని కూడ ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. ఇటీవల ఆంధ్రప్రదేశ్ లోని మహాసభ ఒకటి జరిగింది. అప్పుడు, జవాను మిల్లు ఒట్టల వర్కరులు, అమెరికన్ వర్కరులు ఇంగ్లీషు వర్కరులు, ఇతర ప్రాంతాల వ్యాపారస్థులందరికూడ అక్కడ సమావేశమై, ఏ విధంగా విదేశ వస్త్రములను పంపిణీ చేసుకొంటామని, ఏ విధంగా విభజించుకొంటామని చర్చించారు కాని వారు ఒక పరిష్కార మార్గమునకు రాలేకపోయారు. ఇందుకు పర్యవసానంగా సామ్రాజ్యవాదులదే పెత్తనమే పోయింది. అమెరికన్ కోటీశ్వరులు అమెరికన్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు, అన్నిటిని స్వాధీనముచేసుకొని, జవాను పరిశ్రమలను కూడవారు స్వాధీనముచేసుకొని తూర్పు దేశాలకు గడ్డను దిగుమతి చేయడానికి ప్రయత్నము చేస్తున్నారు. అటువంటి గొప్ప పోటీని ఎదుర్కోవడం మన భారతదేశములో ఉన్నటువంటి ఈ వస్త్రపరిశ్రమకు చాలా కష్టమైయుంటుంటే విషయము. అదే సమయంలో ఇంగ్లీషు గడ్డలకూడా జోరుగా దిగుమతి అగుచునే ఉన్నది. మనము ఎంతోకాలం నుంచి విదేశ వస్త్రములను నిషేధించాలని వాటిని దిగుమతి చేసుకోవడం మన చేనేత పారిశ్రామికాలను కాపాడాలని జాతీయోద్యమములచేసి ఆశించియుంటే కార్యము ఇక్కడికిని ఫలింపకుండుట విచారకరము. విదేశమునుండి దిగుమతిలేకుండా చేయవలసిన మనదేశములో ఉత్పత్తిని అధికముచేయుటకు మిల్లు పరిశ్రమ అభివృద్ధిచెందవలసియున్నది. ఈ విధంగా మనదేశంలో మిల్లు పరిశ్రమను అభివృద్ధిపరచి విదేశవస్త్రాల దిగుమతిని నిరోధించాలి. జాతీయోద్యమమునకు నాయకత్వము వహిస్తూయుండిన వారు ఈ రోజు అధికారములో మంత్రివర్గములో ఉన్నప్పుడు, వారికి ఇది మొదటి చర్యగా మొదటి బాధ్యతగా గుర్తించవలసిన విధియని నేను మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ సందర్భమున ఈ లిక్కానానికి ఒక సవరణ ప్రతిపాదించబడింది. దీనిని అంగీకరించవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. ఇంకొక విషయమున్నది. మన దేశములో ప్రజల కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిపోతున్నది. ఈ రోజు లిండిలేక ఎంతకుంది అవస్థపడుతున్నారో, అంతకంటే ఎక్కువమంది గడ్డలేక అవస్థపడుతున్నారని అను విషయాన్ని కూడ గుర్తించవలసిన మనసగుచున్నది. అయిదు సంవత్సరములక్రితము సగటు మనిషి 1 కి 16 గజాలు గడ్డ వాడుతూయుండగా ఈ రోజున 12 గజాలో, 11 గజాలో మాత్రమే వాడుచున్నట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. ఈ రీతిగా గడ్డ వాడడము మన దేశములో తగ్గిపోయిందంటే అందుకు కారణము కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిపోయిపోతున్నదనే గ్రహించవలసియున్నది. ఈ కొనుగోలుశక్తి వృద్ధికానిదే చేనేత పారిశ్రామికాల సమస్యపరిష్కారముకాజాలదనికూడా గ్రహించాలని నేను హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. ఈనాడు చేనేత పరిశ్రమలో చాలా చీరలు, దోవతలు ఉత్పత్తి చేయబడుతూనే యున్నవి, కాని ఏ స్టాంటిలోమోచినా, సరకు నిలువ ఉండిపోతున్నది. ఈ సరకుకు మార్కెట్టు లభించుటకు ప్రజలందరు చేనేత దోవతలను, చీరలనే కట్టి చేనేతపారిశ్రామికాలకు సహాయముచేయండిని మొట్టమొదట ఒక విజ్ఞప్తిచేశారు. ఇప్పుడుకూడా ఒక విజ్ఞప్తిచేయవచ్చు. కాని, ఇంతమాత్రముతో ఈ సమస్య పరిష్కారముకాదు. ఇందుకు పోటీగా మిల్లువాళ్లు చౌకగా దోవతలు చీరలు తయారుచేసి వాటికి రంగు బొర్రయ్యే వేసి అతి చౌకగా అమ్మవచ్చును. అప్పుడు సహజముగా పేదవారంతా చౌకగడ్డనే కొందురు. వారికి చేనేత పారిశ్రామికాల కష్టాలను గుర్తించి, వారికి సహాయముచేయుటకుగాను చేనేతవస్త్రములనే కొనవలసిన తామతుకూడా లేకుండా వుంటుంది. సంఘములో ఉన్నటువంటి ప్రతిఒక్కరి అధి

12-3
p.m

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [4th November 1952]

వృద్ధి పరస్పర సహాయమునైన, అర్థిక పరిస్థితిపైన ఆధారపడియుంబుంది, అనగా inter-dependent గా ఉండుండన్న మాట. కనుక ఒక చేనేత వారిశ్రామికులకు రక్షణ ఇచ్చాము అని అనుకున్నంతమాత్రమున వారికి అది నిజమైన రక్షణ కాజాలదు. వీరు ఉత్పత్తి చేసేటటువంటి సరకును కొనుక్కోనేవారు లేకపోయినప్పుడు, వారి సమస్య ఎట్లు పరిష్కరించుకునే ఆలోచించుకొనవలసియున్నది. అందుకనే పేదవారికి, ఖామి లేనటువంటి వారికి ఖావసరి కలుగజేసి వాళ్ల ఖాములను సాగులోనికివచ్చునట్లు తగు ఏర్పాట్లుచేసి ఆ విధంగా వారి ఆర్థిక స్థితిని అభివృద్ధిపరచి వారి కొనుగోలుశక్తి పెంచే టటువంటి సదుపాయము గురించి ముఖ్యముగా ప్రభుత్వము ఆలోచించినట్లయితే, అప్పుడే ప్రజలందరిలో ఒక భాగమైనటువంటి ఈ చేనేత వారిశ్రామికులకు నిజమైన రక్షణ, నిజమైన guarantee కలిగిన రోజు ఏర్పడగలదు. కనుక ఈ ఆర్థికవిధానాన్ని వాగుచేయడానికి తప్పనిసరిగా ప్రభుత్వము పూనుకోవాలి, అందుకు కొన్ని ప్రాథమిక మైనటువంటి మార్పులు ప్రభుత్వము తలపెట్టాలి. కనుక కేవలము ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని అనుసరించినంత మాత్రాననే వారి సమస్య పరిష్కరింపబడదు. ఇది కేవలము ప్రథమ దారితిస్తుంది. అందువల్ల దీనితోపాటు మిగతావర్తమాకూడ తీసుకోవాలని ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను మంత్రివర్గము ఆంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుచూ ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI H. B. ARI GOWDER :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I join hon. Members of this House who have paid tributes to the Hon. Chief Minister for the sincerity with which he is trying to relieve the distress of the handloom weavers. But beyond that, I am afraid, I cannot say much in favour of the resolution before the House. It seems to me that it is a counsel of despair. This House is at its wit's end to find a suitable solution. It is true that this resolution, when given effect to, will relieve the distress of the people concerned to some extent. But it will do so, not without affecting the interests of the people at large. For hereafter the people will have to pay more for their clothing. That has been admitted by the Hon. Minister for Industries himself in his speech. Besides that, we will be restricting the freedom of the people, which freedom has been curtailed to a large extent already in other ways. And then, aesthetically, it will put the hands of the clock back. I believe there are many members here who share my views, but few of them dare speak on this subject on the lines I have suggested, lest their speeches should be misconstrued as unsympathetic towards handloom weavers. I may say again that this measure will relieve the distress of the handloom weavers to some extent for some time; but it will not work in the long run.

“ I have not got any well-thought plan to solve this problem at the moment, but what strikes me at present is that we can relieve the distress of these people by adopting other measures than the one which is being taken into consideration to-day. Among the other measures, I suggest that we should supply the weavers with powerlooms; and where the weavers are concentrated in particular areas, we should erect mills for them. In other cases, I suggest that they be settled on land. Besides these suggestions I would request the Government to absorb them in their departmental works as far as possible and to make an appeal to others to employ

4th November 1952] [H. B. Ari Gowder]

them. I am sure the Government, and particularly, the Hon. Chief Minister, must have considered deeply the pros and cons of this resolution. But at the same time I cannot help expressing the view that has not been expressed by other Members. I think I am right in suggesting that this resolution be not given effect to, but that other suggestions may be tried. I am sure there will be quite a number of suggestions which may strike the Hon. the Chief Minister himself, if he takes a little more time to think over this problem; and it may be possible for other hon. Members of this House also to make other suggestions, if they are given time. I therefore suggest that this resolution be not rushed through."

* SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have to state that this resolution is a most commendable one; because, it relates to a very large section of the population of our State. Sir, we have seen before our eyes in the streets, may, even at the doorsteps of our house, streams of workless handloom weavers going about for their sustenance. This House is aware that their condition is most miserable. There are also other sections of people not merely in this State but in other parts of India also who are undergoing untold misery and a lot of hardship on account of other reasons. But it will not be possible for any of us here to-day to analyse the causes thereof in the limited time given to us. Further I have to speak here only on the handloom weavers' problem. In this connexion I would even pay a tribute, even though I am sitting on the opposite side of the House, to our Chief Minister for the untiring and relentless effort that he has taken to see through this problem.

“ Then, Sir, I would like to say something about the economics of handloom cloth and how the handloom cloth has got to be pushed through for the welfare of the handloom weavers in our States. In my humble view, it is not merely a question of helping the handloom weavers but it is also a question of helping ourselves. We have been accustomed for a very long time in the recent past to wear only mill clothes. We, at least some of us, have been attacking the capitalists and the machinery system but, on the other hand, we have been practising only those things which we want to put down and which we want to attack. We should have long ago taken to handloom cloth. In my view, most of us neglected this aspect. It is high time that at least now, when we have heard their cry, we should go to their succour. Let their cry not become a cry in the wilderness. This move is the most humanitarian help that has been rendered to the weavers by this Government at this stage.

“ As regards the economics of handloom cloth, an interesting article has been written by Mr. Lobo Prabhu in one of the current issues of the *Madras Information* which we are all getting free from the Government. I had occasion to go through that article with earnestness and I studied it closely. It discloses how the economics of handloom cloth goes about and how a solution of this problem would not only go to the help of the handloom weavers

[Sri V. R. Nagarajan] [4th November 1952]

but would also help ourselves. While I am speaking on this subject, I am also reminded about a lesson that I learnt while I was a student of economics in the B.A. class in the St. Joseph's College, Tiruchirappalli, where, I remember, my tutor taught me the economics of handloom cloth even as it was imagined and taught to us by Mahatma Gandhi. Handloom cloth is a matter of life and death for our own people and we cannot afford to neglect this problem. We have almost solved it and let us hope, Sir, in the name of God that this solution would be a lasting solution for those people who have been affected most. Thank you, Sir."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I also rise like my colleagues in the House to congratulate the Government and to support the resolution. There is not much to say unless one indulges in repetition. A very good case was made out by the Hon. Minister for Industries and there is very little to add to it. My only regret is that this move was not taken up by the Government sometime ago, for some distress could have been saved and some suffering on the part of the handloom weavers' families could have been avoided, if timely steps had been taken by the Government. It is not too late. I do not believe in the hackneyed expression 'better late than never' for sometimes 'late' is as bad as 'never'.

" I would like to place one or two facts before the Government. In the first place, I do not take this measure merely as an effort to relieve distress but take it also as an effort to revive and give a new life to our decaying and decadent cottage industries. The handloom industry and textiles in general received a set back on the advent of the British and the textile industry never received the kind of support that it is receiving to-day from the Government. We stand for large scale industrialization, for it is only through large scale industrialization that it is possible for us to relieve unemployment, but in the circumstances that are obtained now in our country like lack of finance, dearth of technical skill and general backward conditions, it may not be possible to have a large scale industrialization immediately. The only way out or the immediate way out is to resort to the resuscitation of our arts and crafts and thereby relieve some amount of congestion in the labour market. I am therefore wholeheartedly supporting this move and I would even suggest that the Government should pick up other cottage industries that deserve to be supported, for it would help us not only to revive our cottage industries but would, as I said, relieve the congestion in the labour market. My colleagues from Malabar have underscored the difficulties that the handloom weavers in Malabar labour under and their inability to take full advantage of the help that the Government are offering. My advice to the handloom weavers in Malabar is that as soon as possible they should readjust their looms in such a way as to make production of dhoties and sarees possible. There are a number of weavers' co-operative concerns in Malabar and it ought not to be difficult for them to get help from the Government in order to achieve this.

4th November 1952] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

“ There is, Sir, only one more fact which I wish to place before the Government and which has not received sufficient stress in this House, viz., the interest of the consumer. I do not believe in giving a *carte blanche* to the producers in a society constituted as it is to-day. Since the producers are only guided by the profit motive, there will be a tendency towards consolidation and control of prices. The reason why the handloom weavers are not able to compete with the mill-owners is because of the difference in price between the handloom cloth and mill cloth. Now, when we create monopolistic conditions and when the weavers are able to control the market, they are likely to dictate prices to the consumer. This should be avoided. The Government should, as and when they try to implement the resolution, bear in mind the interests of the consumer and see that the prices do not shoot up to such an extent that it will be difficult for the consumer to meet his demands. This is all that I wish to say. I thank you, Sir.”

* SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am glad that a Government resolution has for the first time received so much support and has been acclaimed with such enthusiasm. I wish that in other subjects too there is such unanimity from all parts of the House unless it be so controversial as to provoke opposition. This is a subject where we need be afraid that the Central Government may not come to our aid in seeing that the resolution is implemented. But my apprehension is that the opposition will be more from the vested interests who are interested in seeing that this resolution is defeated or its effect is nullified than the opposition from the Central Government itself. With the pull that our Hon. the Chief Minister has got with the Central Government, I am sure, he will be able to make the Central Government agree with the reasonableness of our request to reserve the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees to the handloom industry. In this connexion, we have got to face the opposition to this proposal from the vested interests. When I say, ‘opposition from vested interests’, I mean ‘opposition from mill owners’. Their business and profits will be affected if a reservation of this kind with regard to the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees is made and, I am sure, they will not take this resolution lying down and will give a good fight to the Government. I request the present Government and our revered leader to see that the vested interests do not score a point over us through the Central Government.

“ From my own enquiries and the representations that have been made to me, I learn that in some districts—one or two districts at least—towels are being exclusively manufactured, that in some districts weavers are interested only in manufacturing dhoties and that in some districts only in sarees. If towels are not included among the items to be reserved for weaving by handloom weavers, the handloom industry in one or two districts mainly interested in the manufacture of towels will be hard hit. Therefore, I request the Hon. the Chief Minister to modify the

12-40
p.m.

12-50
p.m.

[Sri S. Panchaksharam] [4th November 1952]

resolution under discussion to include towels also to be reserved along with bordered dhoties and coloured sarees to the handloom industry.

"There is also an apprehension in the minds of people that even if the Central Government accept our resolution and give effect to it and the vested interests also reconcile themselves to the present situation, the mill owners may try to manufacture white sarees of a cheaper variety on a very large scale and dump them on the market and make the poor people go in for cheaper white sarees, in which case, the effect of this resolution will be nullified. There is also a similar apprehension with regard to the reservation of bordered dhoties also. Nowadays there is a move on the part of handloom industry to manufacture borderless dhoties which we find are being sold by street hawkers and in shandies. If mills begin to manufacture mulls on a large scale and sell them cheaply, then also the purpose of this resolution, namely, to help the handloom industry will be defeated. I request the Government and the Hon. the Minister who moved the resolution to see that such attempts to manufacture plain mull and white sarees by mill-owners are not made.

"The feeling in the country is that the proposal of the Central Government to levy a cess of three pies per yard of mill cloth is not enough to ameliorate the lot of handloom weavers and the rate of levy must be raised. The rate of levy must be many times more than the one now proposed if it is really going to make it possible for the handloom industry to compete with the mill industry successfully.

"Besides, Government also must make attempts to remove the ban on the export of handloom goods from India imposed by Governments in Ceylon and Burmah. The lungis manufactured in our parts have got a great demand in Ceylon. But the Government of Ceylon insists that we should purchase a portion of Ceylon lungis in return for their purchasing our lungi. Government should make attempts to remove bans of this type imposed by other countries. I also endorse the proposal made by my learned friend Sri Arunachalam that whenever our Government enter into agreement with other countries with regard to the sale of mill-goods produced in our country, they should include a provision in the agreement compelling them to take a portion of our handloom goods also. With these words, I support the resolution."

*** SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—**"கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த தீர்மானத்தை நான் வரவேற்கிறேன். இருந்தாலும் அதில் இருக்கக்கூடிய அபாயகரமான கருத்துக்களுக்கு இடம் கொடுக்கக்கூடாது என்பதற்காகத்தான் நான் சில திருத்தங்களை பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன். நம்முடைய நாட்டில் கைத்தறி தொழிலுக்கு ஆபத்து நம் நாட்டினுடைய மில் தொழில் வளர்ச்சி என்ற தப்பான கருத்தை இந்த தீர்மானம் மூலமாக பரப்பும் ஆபத்து இருக்கிறது. நம் நாட்டின் கைத்தறிக்கம் மில் தொழிலுக்கம் பொதுவான ஆபத்து இன்றைக்கு எது என்றால் இங்கு இருக்குமதி செய்யப்படும் அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளியும், மட்ட ரக ஜவுளியும் தான். என்றைக்கு இந்த அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளி இருக்குமதி செய்யப்பட்டதோ அன்றே இந்த நாட்டின் தொழிலுக்கு ஆபத்து ஏற்பட்டுவிட்டது. அவைகள்

4th November 1952] [Sri M. Kalyanasundaram]

இந்த தொழிலை நாசம் செய்வதோடல்லாமல் நம் நாட்டின் இளைஞர்களின் நாகரீகத்தையும் நாசம் செய்கிறது. “முந்திரு” போன்ற நாடகங்களை தடைசெய்யும் இந்த மந்திரி சபை நிர்வாகன பெண் படங்களை துணியில் அச்சப்போட்டு அந்த துணியை தரித்துக்கொண்டு இந்த நாட்டில் இளைஞர்கள் திரியக்கூடிய நிலைமையில் அந்நிய நாட்டு துணி இறக்குமதியை அனுமதிப்பது நமது நாட்டிற்கு அவமானமல்லவா என்று கேட்கிறேன். நமது நாட்டின் நாகரீகத்தை இழிவு படுத்துவதாலும், நமது தொழிலை சீர்குலைப்பதாலும், அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளி துணி இறக்குமதி செய்யப்படுவதை தடை செய்யவேண்டும். அதற்காக நான் ஒரு திருத்தத்தை கொண்டு வந்து பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன்.

“இரண்டாவதாக நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படவேண்டும் என்ற நோக்கம் இருப்பதாக இந்த தீர்மானம் கூறுகிறது. இப்பொழுது இருக்கும் நிலைமையில் கைத்தறிக்கு எவ்விதம் நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படும் என்பதை கவனிக்கவேண்டும். நிலையான மார்க்கெட் வேண்டுமென்றால் அதற்கு இரண்டு வித வழி செய்யப்படவேண்டும். ஒன்று கைத்தறிமில் உற்பத்தி செய்யக்கூடிய மட்ட ரகத் துணியை உபயோகப்படுத்தக்கூடிய பெருவாரியான விவசாய பெண்களும், ஆண்களும்—இப்பொழுதுதான் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு துணிச்சுழுவில் மறுதுணி வாங்க முடியாமல் இருக்கிறார்களே—மலிவாக கிடைக்கும்படி, செய்யவேண்டும். மேலும் அவர்கள் என்ன வாங்கும் சக்தியை பெருக்கவேண்டும். விவசாயிகள்தான் பெரும்பாலும் கைத்தறி துணிகளை உபயோகிப்பவர்கள். அப்பொழுதுதான் நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படும்.

“1947-ம் வருஷத்திற்கு முன்பாக, அதாவது நமக்கு சுதந்தரம் கிடைப்பதற்கு முன்பாக, இந்த தொழிலுக்கு இரண்டு கோடி ரூபாய் நமது மாகாணத்தில் மட்டும் ஒதுக்கி வைக்கப்பட்டிருந்தது. இப்பொழுது அந்த மான்யம் நிறுத்தப்பட்டு இருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது வர்ணப் புடவைகளை ஒதுக்கி வைக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். ஆனால் வர்ணத்தின் விலை பத்து மடங்கு உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. வர்ணப் புடவைகளுக்கு மலிவாக வர்ணம் கிடைத்தால் புடவைகளை குறைந்த விலைக்கு கொடுக்க முடியும். ஆகவே வர்ணத்தின் விலையை குறைக்கவேண்டும். இப்பொழுது வர்ணத்திற்கு இறக்குமதி செய்யப் போடப்பட்டு வருவதால் அதன் விலை அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது. வர்ணத்தின் விலையை குறைக்க முடியாவிட்டாலும் கைத்தறிக்கு ஒதுக்கும் வர்ணத்திற்கு மட்டும் சப்ளிடி கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்றும் அதற்கு இரண்டு கோடி ரூபாய் ஒதுக்க வேண்டுமென்றும் முன்பு இருந்தது போல் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்றும் இந்த திருத்தத்தை பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன்.

“அதோடு மாகாண சர்க்கார் மத்திய சர்க்காரை கட்டுப்படுத்த இந்த 1 p.m. தீர்மானத்தை கொண்டுவரும்பொழுது, தாங்களாகவே என்னென்ன நடவடிக்கையெல்லாம் எடுக்கலாமோ அவையெல்லாம் எடுத்தார்களா என்று நாம் சிந்தித்து பார்க்கவேண்டும்.

“இந்த மந்திரி சபை அதிகாரத்திற்கு வந்த பிறகு ஒரு ஹை பவர் கமிட்டி நியமிக்கப்பட்டது. அந்த ஹை பவர் கமிட்டி சில சீர்தரங்களை செய்துள்ளது. அதில் முக்கியமானது ரயான் ஸ்கீம் என்று நெசவாளர்களின் நலனை உத்தேசித்து எல்லா இடங்களிலும் கோவாப்பேட்டில் சொசைடிகளை ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும் என்பதாகும். அம்மாதிரி எத்தனை சொசைடிகள் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டது. ஏற்படுத்தப்படாவிட்டால் ஏன் ஏற்படுத்தவில்லை? ஏற்படுத்தியிருக்கிற சொசைட்டிகளையும் கூட ஏன் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் பயன்படுத்திக் கொள்ளவில்லையென்பதை அது சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மந்திரி விசாரணை செய்யும்படி நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். சர்க்கார் உத்தரவு போட்டிருந்தும் கூட அதிகாரிகள் இந்த கோவாப்பேட்டில் சொசைடிகளை ஏற்படுத்துவதற்காக சர்க்கார் கொடுக்கவேண்டிய 2½ ரூபாய்களை நெசவாளர்களே முன்னிடி போட்டு கொள்ளவேண்டும், அப்புறம் தாங்கள் தருகிறோம் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அதோடு கூட அதில் உற்பத்தி செய்யப்படுகிற சரக்குகளை யெல்லாம் விற்பனைசெய்து கொள்வதற்கு அந்தந்த ஸ்தாபனங்களே பொறுப்பை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்ப பயமுறுத்துறுங்கள். இதனாலே சரியாக அவைகள் இயங்குவதில்லை. சர்க்கார் நெச

[Sri M. Kalyanasundaram] [4th November 1952]

வாளர்களின் நலனை உத்தேசித்து செய்யக்கூடிய முடிவுகள், திட்டங்கள் எல்லாம் அனுபவத்தில் நெசவாளர்களுக்கு உண்மையாகவே பயன்படுகிறதாவென்பதை அது சம்பந்தப்பட்ட கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் நன்றாக ஆராய்ந்து சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். சர்க்கார் நினைப்பது போல் அவர்கள் எடுக்கும் எந்த நடவடிக்கையும் இப்பொழுது நெசவாளர்களுக்குப் பயன் படவில்லையென்பதை நான் மந்திரி அவர்களுடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக சர்க்கார் இலாக்காக்களுக்கு தேவையாகும் துணிகளையெல்லாம் கைத்தறி துணியாகவே வாங்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக உத்திரவு போடுவது நம்முடைய மாகாண சர்க்காரின் கையில்தான் இருக்கிறது. அம்மாதிரி செய்யவேண்டுமென கைத்தறி தொழிலாளர்கள், சம்மேளனமும், சங்கங்களும் அடிக்கடி சர்க்காரிடமும், மந்திரிமார்களிடமும் வற்புறுத்தி வந்திருக்கின்றன. சர்க்கார் குறிப்பாக போலீஸ் இலாகா, வைத்திய இலாகா, ஜெயில் இலாகா போன்றவைகளில் தேவையாகும் துணியெல்லாவற்றையும் கைத்தறி துணிகளாகவே வாங்க வேண்டுமென்று உத்திரவு போட்டுவிட்டால் கைத்தறிகாரர்களுக்கும் அந்த ரகத் துணியை நிறைய உற்பத்தி செய்வார்கள். முழு மூச்சுடன் தறிகள் வேலை செய்ய ஆரம்பித்தால் அத்தொழில் கொஞ்சம் முன்னேற சாதனமுண்டு.

“இன்னொரு யோசனையையும் மந்திரி சபையின் கவனத்திற்கு கொண்டுவர நான் விரும்புகிறேன். சர்க்கார் இலாகாவில் கிராமத்து வெட்டியான் முதல், சிப் செக்டரி வரையில் நிறைய சிப்பந்திகள் இருக்கிறார்கள். இம்மாதிரி சர்க்கார்களில் இருக்கிற சிப்பந்திகள் எல்லோரும் கைத்தறித் துணிகளைத்தான் வாங்கவேண்டுமென்று ஒரு மாதச் சம்பளத்தையாவது கடனாக கொடுத்து அவர்கள் எல்லோரும் கைத்தறி துணிகள் வாங்கும்படியாக ஏன் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளக் கூடாதென்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். கைத்தறிகாரர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்வது போலவும் ஆகும், சர்க்கார் சிப்பந்திகளுக்கும் நல்லது செய்ததைப் போலவும் ஆகும்.

“இம்மாதிரியாக பல நடவடிக்கைகளை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் தான் உண்மையில் நம்முடைய மந்திரி சபை கை நெசவு தொழிலுக்கு ஊக்கம் அளிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற கருத்துடையதாக இருக்கிறதென்று எல்லோரும் நம்பமுடியும். இல்லாவிட்டால் இந்தமாதிரியான தீர்மானத்தின் மூலம் பிரசார லாபம் கிடைக்குமே தவிர கைத்தறி தொழிலுக்கு எந்த விதமான பரிசாரமும் ஏற்படாதென்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். இத்துடன் என் பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

(At this stage Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.)

* SRI T. SHANMUGAM :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த மாகாணத்திலுள்ள கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் சென்ற நான்கைந்து வருஷகாலமாக மிகவும் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். அது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரிந்த விஷயம்தான். அவர்கள் எனக்கு முன்பேசிய நண்பர்கள் சொன்னமாதிரியாக பின்னணுத், கத்தாழை போன்ற இப்பேரப்பட்ட வஸ்துக்களைத் தின்று பிழைத்தார்கள். பிழைக்க முடியாமல் செத்தார்கள் எத்தனை எத்தனையோ ஆயிரம்பேர்கள். இப்பொழுதாவது மீதமுள்ள நெசவாளர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்ய வேண்டுமென்பதாக நமது முதன் மந்திரி ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் செய்த இந்த முடிவை நான் ரொம்பவும் மகிழ்ச்சியோடு வரவேற்கிறேன். வேஷ்டி, கலர், சேலை போன்ற இவைகளின் உற்பத்தியை தனியாக கைத்தறிகளுக்கே விட்டுவிடவேண்டுமென்ற யோசனையை முதன் முதலாகக் குறிப்பிட்டுச் சொன்னது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களே தான். ஆகவே யார் சொல்லாமலும் அவர் வாயிலிருந்தே வந்த இந்த பிரேரணையை கடைசி வரையிலும் ஒரே எண்ணமாக இருந்து நிறைவேற்றி வைக்கவேண்டிய பொறுப்பும் அவர்களுடையதுதான். இதுவிஷயமாக எவ்வளவு இடைஞ்சல்கள், முட்டுக்கட்டைகள் ஏற்பட்டபோதிலும் அதை வெற்றிகரமாக

4th November 1952] [Sri T. Shanmugam]

முடிப்பது ராஜாஜியின் பொறுப்பாகும். இதில் கட்டாயமாக மத்திய சர்க்கார் ஏதாவது முட்டுக்கட்டை போடத்தான் செய்யும். ஏனென்றால் மத்திய சர்க்காரை நடத்துகிறவர்கள் Mill Owners. அந்த மில் முதலாளிகள் தங்களுக்கு நஷ்டம் ஏற்படுவிடுமென்று எண்ணும் போது இதை எப்படி ஆதரிப்பார்கள்? ஆகையால்தான் ராஜாஜியின் யோசனையை ஒப்புக் கொள்ளமாட்டார்கள். பல தடைகளையும் இதற்கு உண்டாக்குவார்கள். அப்படி ஏதாவது ஏற்பட்டால் நமது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் டெல்லிக்கே நேராகப்பேய் நேருஜி அவர்களுடன் பேசி இந்த காரியத்தை வெற்றி கரமாகக்கட்டாயம் முடித்தே தரவேண்டும். வெற்றி கிடைக்காவிட்டால் நாம் என்ன செய்யவேண்டும் தெரியுமா? மத்திய சர்க்காரின் பிடியிலிருந்து நாம் கட்டாயமாக விலகி கொள்ளவேண்டும். அப்புறம் மத்திய சர்க்காரின்கீழ் இந்த மாகாண சர்க்கார் வேலை செய்யவே கூடாது. தனச் சுதந்திரத்தை ஏற்படுத்திக்கொள்ள முயல்வேண்டும். பர்மா, சிசிலான் போல தனித்து இடங்கி நம் மாகாணத்திற்கு வேண்டிய நன்மைகளை நாம் அவர்கள் கையை எதிர்பார்க்காமல் செய்து கொள்ளக்கூடிய தனி சுதந்திரத்தை நாம் அடைந்து விடவேண்டும். அப்புறம் எதற்காக மத்திய சர்க்காரில் ஒரு நாளாவது இருப்பது என்பதை நாம் யோசிக்க வேண்டும். நமது ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்களின் நெருங்கிய நண்பரான பெரியார் ஈ.வே. ராமசாமி அவர்கள் தமிழ் நாடு, தனித் திராவிட நாடு என்பதாக வல்லலாம் கத்து கத்தென்று கத்திக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ நீங்கள் சபையின் முன்னுள்ள subject-ஐ பற்றியே பேசுங்கள்.”

* SRI T. SHANMUGAM :—“ நான் இங்குள்ள Subject-ஐ பற்றித் தான் பேசுகிறேன். கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் திராவிட நாடு என்று செ. ன்னனும் சொல்லட்டும் அல்லது சென்னை நாடு என்றோ வேறு ஏதாவது பெயரை வைத்துக் கொண்டோ சொல்லட்டும். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை மில் முதலாளிகள் நிறைந்த மத்திய சர்க்கார் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளாவிட்டால் மத்திய சர்க்காருக்கும் நமக்கும் தொடர்பே வேண்டாமென்று ஒரு தனி ராஜ்யத்தை அவர் ஸ்தாபித்து விடவேண்டும். இலங்கையைப் போல பரமாவைப் போல நாமும் நம் மாகாண மக்களுக்கு பல நன்மைகளைச் செய்து கொண்டு சுதந்திரமாக வாழலாமே. ஆகையினாலே கடைசியாக இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நான் ஆதரிப்பதோடு இக்காரியத்தை நமது ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் எப்படியாவது வெற்றிகரமாக நடத்திக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.”

SRI W. J. FERNANDEZ :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the need 1-10
for the preservation of the handloom weaving industry in the p.m.
national economy of the country has long been recognized. Spinning mills have been protected against foreign competition in order to ensure production in India of the large requirements of yarn by the handloom weavers. As there is considerable unemployment prevailing at the present time among the handloom weavers in the State, it is but right that the handloom industry should be protected against the competition of weaving mills. The Hon. the Chief Minister has urged the Union Government to prohibit weaving mills from producing bordered dhoties and coloured sarees. Such reservation, in the opinion of several eminent Weaving Specialists whom I have consulted, will not help to solve to any appreciable extent, the problem of unemployment and under-employment of a vast magnitude in this country. The State Government will before long have to seek further protection in order to help the weavers in the West Coast and other places, possessing narrow widths of looms and accustomed to weave coloured shirtings and suitings.

[Sri W. J. Fernandez] [4th November 1952]

"Sir, time is not far off when home markets in all classes of fabrics will have to be reserved for the handloom weavers and weaving mills shall have to limit their production to the extent to which they find an export market.

"The days of profit-making by mills have gone and the hour has come for the preservation of the life of the handloom weavers, irrespective of all the theories of economics of handloom cloth. The State Government should straightaway appoint a Standing Advisory Committee of Legislators, weaving experts, marketing officers and businessmen and organize the handloom weaving industry on its technical, commercial, economic and social aspects so that the consumers will have no justifiable complaint of being deprived of cheap mill cloth.

"Handloom production can be compared favourably with powerlooms provided the cottage industry is organized with a proper technical perspective. The Co-operative Department has made rapid progress in recent years in eliminating the sowears and bringing the weavers into the fold of Weavers' Co-operative Societies. No time should now be lost in rendering the handlooms a commercial weaving machine and this can only be achieved by making the spinning mills a link of the weavers' co-operative societies and serving in a proper technical manner for rendering the handlooms, vastly more productive than at present and reducing the cost of production to the utmost possible extent. Mere agitation, or a vote of this House, will not convince the Union Government that the State has done all that is necessary for organizing the handloom industry on a commercial footing before asking for reservation."

* SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ తీర్మానము మాకు సంపూర్ణమైన సంశ్లేషణ కలుగజేయకపోయినప్పటికీ చేనేత కార్మికులను కొంతవరకైనా సహాయపడుతుందని భావిస్తూ దానిని విలపరుస్తున్నాను.

“భారత దేశంలో ఎంతో కాలంగా ఉన్న ఈ పరిశ్రమ బ్రిటిష్ పాలనా కాలంలో పెక్కు ఇబ్బందులకు గురైంది. బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు ఈ పరిశ్రమను ఎప్పుడూ నిరుత్సాహపరుస్తూనే వుండేవారు. వారి దేశంలోని మిల్లు యజమానులకు లాభం కలుగజేయడం ఎట్లా ఆసే వారు అలాగే వుండేవారు. ఈ కారణాలచేత చేనేత పరిశ్రమ దెబ్బతింది. కారణాంతరాలవల్ల బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు మన దేశాన్ని వదిలిపెట్టారు. శరిపాలన కౌగ్రెస్ వారి హస్తగతమైంది. అయినప్పటికీ గత 150 సంవత్సరాలుగా బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు ఎట్టి విధానాలను అనుసరిస్తూ ఉండేవారో అట్టి విధానాలనే కౌగ్రెస్ పాలకులుకూడా అనుసరించారు. మంత్రులు మారారు. మంత్రివర్గాలు మారాయి. వాటితోబాటు చేనేత కార్మికుల స్థితిగతులను బాగుపరచే ఊహలుకూడా మారుతూవచ్చాయి. ఒక మంత్రి ఊహకు మరొక మంత్రి ఊహకు పొత్తుకలిసేది కాదు. చేనేత కార్మికులను రాజకీయ జూదంలో పాచికలుగా ఉపయోగించుకుంటూనే కౌగ్రెస్ గోత్రీకులు ప్రయత్నించారు కాని వారికి నిజంగా చేసిన సహాయమేది కనుపించదు. ఈనాడు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు పాత పంథాలు త్రొక్కరని అభిప్రాయపడ్డారు.

4th November 1952] [Sri G. Anjaneyulu]

“ఇక చేనేత సహకార సంఘాలున్నాయి. వాటి స్థితిగతులుకూడా అధ్యయనం గానే ఉన్నాయని చెప్పవలసి ఉంది. ఎన్నో లోపాలు, వాటిలో కనువిస్తున్నాయి. రాజకీయాల ఒత్తిడివల్లకూడా కొన్ని సంచాలు చెబ్బి లింకున్నాయి. ఈ సంచాల లోనికి మధ్యవర్తుల, పెట్టుబడిదారులు చేరుతున్నారు. రోజురోజుకు వారి ప్రాబల్యం పెరిగిపోతుంది. కష్టించి పనిచేసే చేనేత కార్మికులకు అవి అంతగా ఉపయోగపడలేని స్థితిలో ఉన్నాయి. నూలు కొరకక కార్మికులకు పని కరువైంది. నేయడవిన గుడ్డకుకూడా సరియైన ధర రావటంలేదు. సరుకు విడుదల కానందువల్ల లక్షలాది గజాల గుడ్డ నిలచిపోయివుంది. ముఖ్యంగా మా బందర్ తాలూకాలోని పెదనవంటి ముఖ్య కేంద్రాలలో చేనేత కార్మికులు విపరీతమైన బాధలకు గురౌతున్నారు. వీళ్ల మగ్గాలు నూరు మగ్గాలతో పని చేయించే వ్యాపారస్తులకూడా గుడ్డ విడుదలకాక, పెట్టుబడి లేక, దివ్యానిలేనే స్థితిలోకివచ్చారు. అందుచేత చేనేత కార్మికుని గోలుకత్తి పూర్తిగా నశించింది. నిత్యావసర వస్తువులను కొనుక్కుతేనా వారి కివాడుస్తోమటలేదు. గుడ్డ విడుదలకాక, పెట్టుబడి లేక చేనేత కార్మికులు బాధలుపడుతుంటే గత కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వం వారిని నానా పింసలపాలు చేసింది. దీని బత్యాల్లవైనా సంచాదిండుకోలేని స్థితిలో చేనేత కార్మికులు వారి పిల్లలకు వదులు ఎలా చెప్పించుకుంటారు. అందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగుల పిడ్డలకు ఉచిత విద్యా సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయబడినట్లే చేనేత కార్మికుల పిడ్డలకుకూడా ఉచిత విద్యా సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయవలసినదని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“మా ప్రాంతాలలోని చేనేత కార్మికులకు ఈనాడు ఎట్టి ఆధారంలేక కూలినాలి చేసుకొనవలసిన గతికట్టింది. పిన్నలు, పెద్దలు, స్త్రీలు, పురుషులు అనే వ్యత్యాస మేమీ లేకుండా అందరూ కడుపు చేతబట్టుకొని కూలి ననులకై చేరుతున్నారు. ఈ విషయాలను నేను ఋజువు చేయగలను. దానికితోడు వీరి పశ్చిమ ధనికుల చేతిలో నికి పోతోంది. దానిని ఆరికట్టాలి.

“మరొక ముఖ్య విషయం మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. చేనేత పరిశ్రమ యధాస్థితికి రావాలంటే దానికి కొన్ని ప్రత్యేక రకములవస్త్రాలను కేటాయించాలి. వాటిని మిల్లులు తయారుచేయకూడదని నిషేధించాలి 20, 40 లోపు నెంబరు నూళ్లు అనే కేడాలోలేకుండా చేనేత పరిశ్రమకు స్రవ్యేకించాలి. చీరలను దోపితులను మిల్లులు తయారుచేయడం ఆపుచేయించాలి. ఈ నెంబరు నూళ్లను సరఫరా చేసే ధరలకు చేనేత కార్మికులకు సహకార సంస్థలద్వారా సప్లైచేయించాలి. చేనేత కార్మికులందరు సహకార సంఘాలలో చేరునట్లుగా చూడాలి. అవసరమైన సందర్భాలలో వెరు కేపిలను ప్రభుత్వమే యివ్వాలి. ముగ్గునికొక చొప్పున డీవన భృతి ఋణాలు యిచ్చి చేనేత కార్మికులను ప్రోత్సహించాలి. ప్రతిష్ట కోల్పోయిన కాంగ్రెస్ సంస్థను పునరుద్ధరించవలసినదే సంకల్పబోకాక, నిజముగా చేనేత కార్మికుల స్థితిగతులను చక్కబరచుటకు హృదయపూర్వకంగా కృషి సల్పవలసినదని ఆయనను తిరిగి కోరుతున్నాను. ఇంకొక ముఖ్యమైన విషయం గురించి మనవి చేస్తాను. ఈ శాసన సభలో పలు భాషలవారున్నారు. ఒకరి భాష మరొకరికి బోధపడదు. ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానం జయత్రదం కావాలంటే అటువంటి లీర్తానకు లమీద, సభ్యులు మాట్లాడే భాష మెల్లతులకు అర్థం కావాలంటే పరిపాలన మాత్ర భాషలోనే జరిగాలి. నేడు మంత్రులు ప్రసంగించేది హాకు తెలియదు. మేము ఏమి చెబుతున్నామా వారికి అర్థంకాదు. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ఒకరి అభిప్రాయాలు మరొకరికి తెలియటకు గాను ట్రాన్సులేటర్లను నియమించవలసిన అగత్యం ఎంతైనా ఉంది. కాబట్టి అట్టి అనువాదకులను రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు త్వరలో ఏర్పాటు చేస్తారని ఆశిస్తూ ఇంత టికో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

[4th November 1952]

1-20
p.m.

*SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—“అధ్యక్షా, చేనేతపరిశ్రమ అనేది భారత దేశంలో అనాదిగా ఉంటూఉన్నది. చేనేతపరిశ్రామికులు ఎంతో కాలంగా జనసామాన్యానికి కావలసినటువంటి రకరకముల వస్తువులను తయారుచేస్తున్నారు. వారికి ఇదే జీవనోపాధి. ఒక కులవృత్తిగానే దానినివారు పాటించక ఆ పరిశ్రమను కళాస్వరంగా చేసేదెహదా సాలివారే. వినాడు అయితే వారి కడుపునిండుగా ప్రంతున్నదో ఆ నాడే వారు యీ చేనేతపరిశ్రమను ఉత్పత్తిచేసే విధానాన్ని మార్చి కళాస్వరంగా బట్టలను తయారుచేస్తూవచ్చారు. గుడ్డలను తయారుచేసి భోజనమునకు సరిపాడ్యుధాని ఆర్పించుటకు ఒక్కొక్కప్పుడు రంగులు మొదలగువానిని అద్దించే విషయములో అందరు కలసి సమిష్టిగా కనిచేస్తూవచ్చారు. కాని యీనాడు మిల్లు బట్టావచ్చినప్పటినుంచి యీ నేతపరిశ్రమ వృద్ధిపొందే అవకాశములేకుండాపోయింది. మిల్లు బట్ట తయారు అగుటకై వారి పరిశ్రమలు దెబ్బతిన్నది. ఇదియునూగాక వారికి భూములుకూడా లేనికారణంచేత మనస్సులలోని కష్టను జీవనోపాధికొరకు చంపుకొని విదోషభ్రమన పాలి నాలికొడుగులు. వినాడు యీ మిల్లు గుడ్డను దేశములో ఎక్కువగా తయారుఅయినదో, యీ చేనేతపరిశ్రమ అనాటినుండి మూలబడ్డది. యీ మిల్లు గుడ్డలు ప్రజలకొనుట ఆరంభించిననాడే యీ చేనేతవారికి భోజనముఉండునా, అనిపించింది. అనాటినుంచి యీనాటి వరకు చేనేతబట్టలను మానకొని యీచేనేత వారు యంత్రాలమూలంగా గుడ్డలను తయారుచేయటానికి కోరుతు పూనుకొన్నారు. కాని ఎక్కువమంది వీర ప్రజానికానికి చెందినవారుగుటచేత యీ యంత్రములను కొనుక్కొనే తాహతు లేక జీవనవృత్తిగూడాతగ్గి కొనుగోలు శక్తిలేనివారై ఉంటున్నారు. ఈ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులకు జీవనవృత్తి కలిగించటానికి ప్రభుత్వవారు పూనుకొని ప్రోత్సహించవలసియున్నది. ఈ నాడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రతిపాదించ తీర్మానమును గౌరవనీయులైన సభ్యులందరూ ఒకపక్షమై ఉన్నారు. ఈ తీర్మానమును కేంద్రప్రభుత్వము ఓప్పుకొనినట్లయితే యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులకు ఆహారము సమృద్ధిగా లభిస్తుందని నా విశ్వాసము. ఇంకను వారికి ప్రభుత్వమువారు సహకారసంఘాలద్వారా తగు ధన సహాయము చేయగలిగితే యింకా శ్రేష్టమైన గుడ్డ తయారుచేయగలరు. అలాంటి గుడ్డను తయారుచేయుటకు తోడ్పడే యీ తీర్మానమును నేను మనస్ఫూర్తిగా బలపరుస్తున్నాను.

“ఇంతేకాకుండా గౌరవనీయులైన సభ్యులందరికీ తెలిసినటువంటి సామెత ఒక యున్నది. ఆదేమనగా సాలినేత, మాలినేత అనేది. దీనికి కారణము పూర్వమునుంచి యీ చేనేతపరిశ్రమచేయువారు సాలికులనులేకాకుండా ముతకబట్టిన తయారుచేసే వాళ్లు మాలవాళ్లుగూడా ప్రంతున్నారు. వీరు చిరకాలమునుండి 10 వ నెంబరు మొదలు 20 వ నెంబరువరకు నూలుతో దుప్పట్లు వగైరబట్టలునేసి, అమ్ముకొని జీవించుచున్నారు. యీ చేనేతవారిమాదిరి, వీరికిగూడా జీవనవృత్తి తగ్గియున్నది. కనుక యీ చేనేతవారికి దోపతులు వీరిలు ఏ విధముగ ప్రభుత్వమువారు కేటాయింప దలచియున్నారో, ఆ విధముగానే యీ మాలవారికి ముతకనెంబరునూలు కేటాయింపవలెనని ప్రభుత్వమువారికి మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ ముతకబట్టలు ముఖ్యంగా మా కడప జిల్లా జమ్మలమడుగు, ప్రొద్దుటూరు తాలూకాలలో అనేకమంది మాలవాళ్లు నేను కొంటూ జీవనమును సాగించుచున్నారు. ఇట్టివారు మనరాష్ట్రములో ముఖ్యంగా మెట్ట తాలూకాలలో ప్రంతున్నారు. ఇట్టివారికి ముతకనూలు 20 వ నెంబరు వరకు కేటాయింపవలెనని నిరాయోగమువారు ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ ముతకనూలు సాలిలు అంతగా ఉపయోగపడు. ఈ నూలు మాలవాళ్లకొని దుప్పట్లు తయారు చేస్తారు. పైన చెప్పిన విషయములను ప్రభుత్వమువారు గమనించెదరని నాపూర్వ

[Sri T. S. Ardhanari]

[4th November 1952]

அரசாங்கம் இதைச் செய்யமுடியாது. அது மத்திய சர்க்கார் செய்யவேண்டிய காரியம். மத்திய சர்க்காரை நாம் கேட்கிறோம். அதற்குப் பின்னால் அங்குள்ள மந்திரிகள் கூடி விவாதிக்கவேண்டும். அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய மில் முதலாளிகளை ஆலோசனை கேட்கவேண்டும். இன்னும் பல சடங்குகள் நடந்த பிறகு அமுலுக்கு வரும். (நீராம் முடிந்துவிடதென்பதைக் குறிக்க ஸ்பீகர் மணியை அடித்தார்) இன்னும் கொஞ்ச நேரத்தில் முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன், சிறிது அவகாசம் கொடுக்கவேண்டும்.

“கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளர்களிடம் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கக்கூடிய ஜவுளியைக் கொள்முதல் செய்து, மலிவான விலையில் பக்களுக்கு சர்க்கார் வின்னியோகம் செய்யாமல் இருந்தால் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்கமுடியாது. இன்றைக்கு காஞ்சிபுரம் தொழிலாளர்களும், சேலத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களும் கஞ்சித் தொட்டிகளை எதிர்த்தோக்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். பட்டினியைப் போக்கிக்கொள்வதற்கு நாடு பூராவும் பிச்சை எடுப்பதற்கு மனைவி மக்களோடு புறப்பட்டு விட்டார்கள். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றினால்மட்டும் அவர்களுடைய குறைகளைப் போக்கிவிட்டதாகச் சொல்லமுடியாது. ஆகையால், மாகாணத்தில் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கின்ற ஜவுளி பூராவையும் சர்க்கார் கொள்முதல் செய்து மக்களுக்கு குறைந்த விலையில் வின்னியோகிக்கவேண்டும். அதனால் ஏற்படக்கூடிய நஷ்டத்தை சர்க்காரே ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். கொஞ்சமும் சிந்திக்காமல் பொதுவாக வரவரவோ பணத்தை சர்க்கார் விரயம் செய்கிறது. கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்களை சர்க்கார் வீண் விரயம் செய்கிறது. ஆனால், நம் நாட்டு குடிசைத் தொழிலாளியை கைத்தறியாளர்களுக்கு உரண்டு கோடி ரூபாயாவது சர்க்காருடைய பட்ஜெட்டிலிருந்து செலவு செய்யாவிட்டால் அது மிகப் பெரிய தவறு என்பதைச் சொல்லவேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

“சென்ற சட்டசபைக் கூட்டத்திலேயே கைத்தறி நெசவாளருக்கு உதவி செய்வதற்காக சொஸைடியில் எல்லோரையும் மெம்பர்களாகச் சேர்ப்பதற்கு நாங்கள் முயற்சி செய்வோம் என்று சொல்லப்பட்டது, மூன்று மாதங்கள் ஆகிவிட்டது. திருச்செங்கோட்டில் 31-ந்தேதி கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் விஜயம் செய்திருந்தபோது சொஸைடியில் எல்லாத் தொழிலாளர்களையும் சேர்க்கவில்லை என்று சொன்னபோது, அவர் சொன்னார், “அது உண்மையான பற்றம் இல்லை, சொஸைடியின் குற்றம்” என்று. ஆகவே, இன்றைக்கு கைத்தறியாளர்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய கஷ்டங்களைப் போக்குவதற்காக ஒரு திட்டம் கொண்டுவந்தால், அந்தத் திட்டம் சரிவர நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டதா இல்லையா என்று பார்க்காமல் ஒரு மந்திரி மூன்று மாத காலமாக இரந்தது உண்மையிலேயேகைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு இமைத்த ஒரு பெரும் கொடுமை என்று நான் சொல்கிறேன். ஆகவே ஜனங்களுடைய நன்மைக்காக இயற்றப்படும் திட்டமானது சரிவர நிறைவேறுகிறதா இல்லையா என்பதைப் பரிசீலனைசெய்து பார்ப்பதற்குக்கூட அவர்களுக்கு நேரம் இல்லையென்று சொன்னால், அது நெசவாளர்களை ஏமாற்றுவதாகும் என்று எண்ணுகிறேன். தவறு ஏற்பட்ட பிறகு, அந்தத் தவறு எங்களுடையதல்ல, சொஸைடியினுடையது என்று சொல்லக்கூடியது இருக்கிறதே அதைப்பற்றி நான் உண்மையாகவே வருந்துகிறேன். இந்தத் தவறுக்குக் காரணமாயிருந்த மாகாண சொஸைடி ரிஜிஸ்ட்ரார் அவர்கள் மீது இந்தச் சர்க்கார் கண்டிப்பான நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். அப்பொழுதுதான் உண்மையாகவே மக்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்ததாகும்.

“பொதுவாக இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை கனம் ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரி அவர்களுடைய மந்திரி சபை, உண்மையாகவே கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு சேவை செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற உணர்ச்சியோடு, நல்ல அபிப்பிராயத்தோடு, கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட தீர்மானம் என்று நான் நம்பிய போதிலுங்கூட, அதே சமயத்தில் இது ஒரு விளம்பரமாக இருந்துவிடக்கூடாது என்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 3 p.m.”

4th November 1952]

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to take more than two or three minutes. I am rising only to state that I generally support this resolution. There was some criticism to the effect that this was no solution at all. The hon. Member representing the Nilgiris—General criticized the proposals somewhat very severely. I am not going into the defence portion of it for, I believe that the sponsor of the resolution will meet all the criticisms. I was only anxious to see how it would affect the low-income groups if they were compelled to purchase only handloom varieties in case they happened to be more costly than clothes available in the immediate neighbourhood at a lesser cost. But I believe the restriction of the reservation to bordered dhooties and coloured sarees solves the problem to a great extent. While I do not say that I am able to foresee all consequences fully, yet I support the resolution. If in the light of experience it is found that consumers are put to any difficulty, I hope the Government will do the needful. I hope that this ancient cottage industry in which are involved several lakhs of people who have given to the world the finest patterns of weaving and earned a reputation for their skill from the entire world, will get the support which is necessary. Logically speaking, those who believe exclusively in scientific progress and machinery may not be able to support it. Also, those who believe in khadi may not be able to support entirely handloom which is run on mill yarn. But there are bound to be cases where logic ceases to apply in life and other values count and I believe this is one of those cases. Lakhs and lakhs of families have been wedded to this profession of handloom weaving. It has been their hereditary profession for centuries, a profession which has earned for India a worldwide reputation. In such a case I believe that logic should cease to apply and we must have different values of life. It is in this spirit that I support the resolution wholeheartedly.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am extremely grateful on behalf of the Government that support has been expressed from all sections of the House in the manner in which it has been done. The manner in which my hon. Friend Sri Viswanatham gave his support particularly delights me. This resolution has been discussed for a day and a half. It is natural that the warm unanimity that marked the support in the earlier stages of the debate gradually waned down towards the end of the debate into a somewhat critical attitude. When we discuss a thing for a pretty long time, it is natural that we seek to find differences rather than agreements as we proceed. I was not, therefore, surprised to hear Mr. Ari Gowder say that this was a desperate appeal. He expressed his doubts about the wisdom of the proposal. Mr. Fernandez also spoke in a somewhat critical strain. But on the whole, taking the various sections of the House as they have been offering support or criticism on the various matters that come up before them, the unanimity with which support has been given to this resolution is certainly most marked and significant.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[4th November 1952]

" My Hon. Colleague the Minister for Industries opened the debate with a very lucid exposition when he moved the resolution. I do not think he left out any important points and nothing is gained by mere repetition. He has put the case very clearly and concisely. The main thing to be remembered, as was observed by Mr. Viswanatham just now, is that it is not merely a problem of the textile industry or whether one form of machinery should be used to produce cloth or another form of machinery. It is not merely an economic problem. As I said more than once in this connexion, it is a problem of great human interest and value. Let us take, for instance, whether we should support cinemas or dramas. Much can be said in favour of the drama, much can be said in favour of the cinema. There is a conflict between the two. There is no doubt that the cinema has driven the drama out of the society so to say. But yet one may take a very detached view about such a problem. It may be that ultimately the drama will be found to be the better thing. It may be that the larger scope which the cinema has may make it more valuable to society. But it is not as if millions of families are involved in those fields; a few families are engaged in them. But here is an industry involving not a few families but millions of families. Making a most conservative estimate, the number of men, women and children depending on the handloom industry to-day as well as in the past and for a considerable time in the future until some unknown or unexpected industrial revolution takes place in our country, is fifteen millions. I am speaking of India as a whole. Fifteen million souls are involved in this handloom industry. Let me remind statisticians that this equals the entire population of Australia and is one and a half times the population of Canada. Any problem of occupation or profession which involves so many numbers is not merely a matter for statistical research or things of that kind, but it is one which calls for considerations of the greatest human importance. Out of this total population of weaver families, we have in our State alone $4\frac{1}{2}$ million souls to be looked after. Four and a half millions can easily be the population of one of the moderate-sized countries in Europe. So, even the population involved in our own State is large enough to attract other considerations than what seem to be moving industrialists at the present moment. If we do not consider it as the problem of a large population or of a very large number of human units, let us merely look upon it as that of a corps of skilled workers who are available in the country. Let us look upon it only as a problem as to how to deal with the skilled man-power that we have to-day in our country in this regard. Let us understand and let us realise that this large body of skilled workers are not doing national service under any compulsion of law or for an agreed rate of payment by way of wages, but they are doing it as a traditional occupation and are most willingly engaged in it. This labour force excluding all dependants and counting only the principal worker in each case comes to one million workers in our own State. It is one million skilled workers excluding the dependants, assistants and the like. Here, therefore, we are dealing in our State—concentrating only on our State—with one million workers

4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

of a very skilled type. What shall we do with them? Shall we simply tell them, 'You are in a dying occupation, and therefore we do not bother about you. The rights and wrongs of this conflict be on your own head; do what you like with it'? It will be impossible to take up that attitude. If we take an all-India account of it, it would come to six million skilled workers—a corps of skilled workers. Let us remember—though it has been often said, we are likely to forget—that the skilled workers engaged in the handloom industry are more than twice the total number of workers in all other organized industries in our country. The number of workers engaged in the handloom industry is more than twice that of those engaged in other industries, textile, steel and everything included. We have really to grasp the quantum of this problem, and we have also to remember the inescapable fact that this huge man-power cannot change over to any other occupation. They have no lands. They cannot take to agriculture. They cannot find the wherewithal for it, the land for it, or the knowledge for it, or the habit for it, or even the tendency towards it. They cannot change over the habit which for generations they have acquired in this particular craft. Let us also remember that it is not mere unskilled labour. It requires early training. Skill in this craft is acquired from childhood, boyhood or girlhood. When we think of this man-power at our disposal, the importance of the problem can be realised. Ladies and gentlemen in the South do not require to be educated by me in this regard. But I am sorry to find that the problem has not been properly grasped in other quarters, and that is why I am repeating all this from this forum, so to say. We should also grasp the fact that whatever may be the reaction on other sections of the community by way of incidence, those sections of the community cannot carry on with their business or with their civic or political or family life if, round about them, six millions of people are in distress and difficulty. It is easy to make a calculation and say that the consumer would not like to pay 2 annas more for a yard or 1 anna more for a yard. Yes, the consumer may have to pay. But what happens to the consumer if there are 15 million unemployed people in India? What happens to the consumer if there are 5 million unemployed people, men, women and children, not having anything to live upon in this State? Can life go on with so much unemployment around us? Therefore, it is necessary to see the size of the problem. It is necessary to see the consequences of our present policy about it and our allowing the conflict to go on. If, therefore, we are able to grasp all these things, we cannot say then all that had been said. It is not a mere case of comparison of mill production with other forms of textile production. But it calls for different considerations of a much deeper import. And this is what I have been appealing for all the time. And why do I come before this House with this resolution? We can achieve nothing by a resolution here. But we can achieve this, i.e., we can show to the Government of India what the representatives of all sections of the communities here in the South feel about this matter and how public opinion has been formed here and has shaped itself here

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

without any steamroller agitation or anything of that kind. Of its own accord it has shaped itself. Human sympathy has shaped it. It is nothing else. If, therefore, we pass this resolution, we pass it in the hope that it will make an impression on those who have the power to order the arrangement of things in our country in this regard. If, for instance—I am putting it in another form—some of my friends will pardon me if they do not like the form, because I am putting it in that form for the purpose of impressing it on other people than those who are here—if, for instance, by any historical accident we discover on a visit to China that there the new Government had set up, on a nation-wide scale, handlooms, each costing only Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 worth of capital investment in simple machinery, and each one of these handlooms producing about 5 yards of cloth per day as against privately owned powerlooms each one of which costs Rs. 1,200 for installation and that the handloom industry spread all over China was producing 4, 5 or 6 yards in each house, and all the handlooms together produced 1,500 million yards, and that as and when more yarn is issued to them they would produce twice that quantity, we would have hailed it as a great discovery and a revolutionary discovery at that. What happens here? We have it here as it is. We have it here in every house. We have it in a million houses in our States, and in 6 million houses throughout India. We have a simple machine. If it is a pit loom with shuttle throwing, it costs Rs. 20 to Rs. 30. If it is a wooden frame loom, without digging a pit to sit over, it costs Rs. 50 to Rs. 60. The weavers have them. We have not distributed them. We have not given money for them. The men have got these already, and they are producing yards of cloth. They can produce not five yards but more yards per day if we only allow them. If we have got them already here, what is the sense in ignoring them and in depending upon the textile industry for producing our cloth and making it difficult for the handloom in refusing to make an arrangement by which the conflict could be avoided, and a stable market secured for this handloom industry? I submit that we have to exercise our imagination. The very thing that we have here, had we discovered in any other country as a result of a new enterprise, we would have welcomed as a great advance in human ingenuity and human endeavour. But when we have it here already, we are really ignoring the position. It has been observed by many visitors when they had been to China—many visitors have gone there—that 2½ million rural workers had been brought together to make a river project. Two and a half million rural workers were brought together to make a river project, and our visitors have gone into ecstasy over the discovery, and very rightly. This is not very different from that. The difference is that the thing here is already there, whereas they have brought it there for the first time. If, from that point of view, the resolution is looked at, the importance of our resolution will be appreciated by those who are not in very close touch with this matter. The visitors who went to China observed with admiration that 2½ million workers were brought to a particular river project. Also they have said that

4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

this labour was not slave labour or conscripted labour. It was more or less voluntary. What is the labour here that I am referring to? It is not only voluntary, but it comes out of their hearts. It is traditional. It has been in their lives for generations, not voluntary merely for one man but voluntary for generations."

(Sri M. Hanumantha Rao rose in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. the Chief Minister has not yielded."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, if we really contemplate and grasp the magnitude of the manpower which is engaged in the production of cloth already in our country, we can realize—my point is this and probably this is the information that is wanted by the hon. Gentleman—we can realize the tragedy of assuming that this industry must perish. That is the point that I wish to make. Very many people begin with a notion that this industry must perish and, therefore they ask, 'What is the good of allowing it to languish in this manner for any while?' They think, 'Let us allow the conflict and speed up or accelerate the conflict rather than try, by some blood transfusion, to maintain a perishing industry.' That is wrong. We cannot hand ourselves over to the tender mercies of the textile industry as a change for the better in this respect. The short-sightedness of this policy is, in my humble opinion, tragic. Powerlooms consume electricity, fuel, and all kinds of materials whereas these handlooms have not demanded and will not demand anything from us except yarn at a fair price which the weavers are willing to pay and which they will put into the product and turn over when they have a market. All that they are asking for is an easy market without a conflict. They do not even ask for subsidy. These handlooms are located in the houses of the workers, employing only the labour of their own family. It is a great decentralised industry which would really serve to maintain the texture of our rural life and not create slums in the towns along with the problems of housing, health and sanitation, with which Governments are unable to deal satisfactorily. At present, the handlooms are employed only for less than half of their full capacity. As was explained, if they produce bordered dhoties and coloured sarees to the fullest extent possible, they can produce the whole quantity which now the mills and the handlooms taken together produce. There is no question, therefore, of any risk or failure in total production.

" The proposal, which this Government have been pressing and which they have asked this House to support, is a very moderate one. There is already—let it be remembered—a good stock of mill cloth in the States. Even if we get this reservation, there is already in all the States a good deal of stock of mill cloth. That stock is lying with the wholesalers and retailers and will act as a buffer in any case. As and when the Government take steps to place an adequate quantity of yarn at the disposal of handlooms and at prices which may be deemed fair, handloom production will

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

certainly go up, if there is any truth in the laws that govern human nature and economics. There are many who maintain that handloom products have a longer life and attractive features. The real difficulty in the way, therefore, of the prosperity of the handloom industry is the fact that the price of foreign cotton enters unduly into the yarn supplied to the handlooms and that the weaving mills, as was pointed out by many speakers, have an advantage in this respect, and that there is a continual conflict in the market between the one product and the other which is priced just a little lower in order to throttle the other commodity's chances.

Now, there is a vague fear, which was expressed concretely by one speaker, that the handloom weaver and his marketing organisation will put up prices if there is no competition between the handloom products and the mill products. It is forgotten, in this connection, firstly, that numerous weavers compete with one another and they are so poor and so numerous that no effort by way of cornering will succeed. The internal competition is so great that ultimately the weaver will have to be satisfied, as he is now, with a fair subsistence wage and the cost of the material. The only thing that he wants is that the subsistence wage should not be reduced, and that is all that we ask for in this Resolution. Secondly, the mills, on the other hand, can and will certainly turn to the production of substitutes, if production of coloured sarees and bordered dhoties is taken away from them. This has been pointed out by some speakers by way of detraction of the present Resolution. No doubt the Resolution will not create a paradise for the weaver. There is the likelihood of the textile mills producing substitutes of all kinds for the cloth which has been reserved to the handloom industry, if this Resolution should be given effect to. That is true, on the one hand, but on the other, it answers the argument of risk. There is the well-known substitute for it. As we all know, people belonging to the older generation here know—we were ourselves, our fathers and our uncles were all using, what was called, mull, i.e., white cloth, which they cut into pieces according to the sizes they wanted. The handloom dhoties were discarded by many and this white cloth, cut into pieces, was used by fashionable people, who thought they looked very nice in that dress. Now they may not think so, but that was the view then. The same thing may happen again if there is any undue rise in the price of handloom cloth and the consumer finds any difficulty. What will happen is that the mills will sell substitutes of cloth fairly easily and nobody will go naked and anybody will find it difficult to clothe himself and even to clothe himself tidily. There may be a change-over to a new custom. People, who wear loose dhoties, may wear tailor-made clothes like bush-shirts and bush-coats. If that happens, we need not regret it. There will be advancement in cleanliness and tidiness of clothing and at the same time, the handloom weaver will not feel that it is a conflict that has killed him, but will take it as a change in manners, and sartorial fashions. The psychology will then be totally different from the present psychology of being stifled under mere market competition. If all of us take to rice or to wheat or change over to a

4th November 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

new form of diet, the merchants will not object. But if there is a different kind of rice or a different kind of wheat in the market, which stifles the traditional occupation of the people here, then comes the psychology of distress, and that is what we do not like and wish to prevent by means of this Resolution.

“ Then, again, the offer of money bonuses and stipends is in the air. Anything is welcome. We are poor and, if money is given, it won't do for us to say ' No '. But I hope that the Government of India which will offer that money, whatever it may be, will tell us what to do with it so that it may be usefully spent. I for one cannot imagine what to do with the share of Madras. It may be a crore of rupees. But what shall we do with it? How shall we help the weaver with it? Shall we put it into the General Budget and bridge the financial gap a little bit? What shall we do with that money to help the weavers? It may be a caricature, but I feel that it would be like the tiger asking the lamb to lick the former before the latter is to be eaten. Will the three pie cess which we get from the mills reduce the production of mill cloth which is to be my conflicting and throttling agency. It is dangerous to earn some money from that which is going to throttle us to the extent that we get it. It is like trying to use the drink revenue for doing propaganda against drink. As I get more money, I get foolish and would want to get more and more money and yet more money, and I would then rather like the drink revenue to go up than go down. In the same manner here, if we get a cess from the mills, unless the cess is a deterrent one, it is no advantage. If, for instance, all the hon. Members of this House agree and we have the legal power to impose a big duty on all mill-made dhoties and sarees which come into this State and if it is a deterrent duty, then I can understand the use of it. If it is a mild cess and it just tickles the mill-owners and if that cess is paid to the handloom weavers here, then it will serve no useful purpose whatsoever. What we want is a completely protected market, let it be clearly understood, in a defined field. We have not asked for too much and this defined field is a substitutable field. It is not like a man giving up a thing altogether. If a defined field is reserved for the handloom industry, there will at the same time be a vast field outside. Here is a case where he who wants to have a particular commodity and cannot get it in one field can go in for a substitute in the other. We want a protected market in a defined field for the handloom industry. The assurance of this reservation must be clearly recognised not only by the weavers, but by the intermediaries, the consumers, the retail goods agents and everybody else. Then there will be a feeling of confidence and a feeling of security and well-being in the millions of handloom weaver families, which would help not only those families, but the entire population. This vast volume of skilled man-power requires this little encouragement and security and given these, they would prove to be one of the finer elements in our society. Most of us know the conditions obtaining in the millions of weaver families. The literacy of weaver families is higher than that of the families of other workers. Their industry and civic loyalty are greater. If

3-30
p.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[4th November 1952]

only we give a little encouragement and security, the man-power will be an exceedingly valuable asset in our civic life. The mills can easily afford this and they will lose very little. That is the point which does not seem to have been fully recognised by those gentlemen who do not like our resolution. The mills can very easily afford to produce a little less than they do now, even though that should become necessary. I don't think it will be necessary. The mills do not stand in need of a particular market, namely, bordered dhoties and sarees. They can produce an infinite variety in bulk. They have a huge market. Not only that. They have a great and expanding market in Asia with a powerful organisation to help them in marketing their products. These are the conditions under which the Government of Madras have been pressing on the Government of India to accept this policy and for which we ask your help through this Resolution.

"The mental background behind the opposition to this proposal is the erroneous conviction that the handloom industry is an industry that should perish. Let us not assume things in that way. It is shocking to see intelligent men, patriotic citizens talking in terms of destruction or the extinction of the occupation of millions of families, each family consisting of more than two persons working at this craft. Whatever may be the prognosis in the economic sphere, we must take it as our present obligation to keep under fairly prosperous conditions these five million souls in Madras State alone. It is our duty to guard against the extinction of any particular wide-spread occupation. As long as these people are willing to work in their own homes with a little turnover, our bounden duty is to help them to carry on their normal honest work. Once upon a time, the East India Company, and later the British Parliament supported a commercial policy in the later 18th and the earlier decades of the 19th centuries. They carried out a policy by which India became subservient to the industries of Great Britain. Their policy was to make the Indian people grow raw products in order to supply materials for the looms in the factories of Great Britain. Now, I refer to this not as a mere stale Anti-British platform matter, but to point out that it is exactly the same policy that is now being pursued or sought to be pursued by the textile mills in India and their friends. They want the handloom weavers to perish and cotton to be grown. That is what they want. We cannot abandon millions of skilled artisans and leave them to the tender mercies of the textile industry. Some propaganda is now being conducted on behalf of the mill industry. The cry of the consumers' interest had been raised in the past and it has been raised now also. But I may tell this House that no consumer-interest can be really protected by allowing six million families in India to perish. This should be clearly understood.

"Sir, much talk is heard about improving the organisation, as if faulty organisation were responsible for the distress of the weavers. It has been mentioned by some hon. Members who do not see eye to eye with us that we should improve the weavers' organisations and the like. Now, it is no use trying to hide the obvious, namely, the conflict between the handlooms and the mills,

4th November 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

by reference to the defects in the handloom weavers' organisation. Let me remind the hon. Members that, as was pointed out by my Hon. Colleague while moving the Resolution, co-operative society organization in Madras has reached a high degree of efficiency. Two lakhs and thirty-five thousand weavers have been brought under registered co-operative societies and about twice that number are associated with many weavers' associations. But this cannot solve the problem of marketing as against the competition of mill products. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies hesitates to take more members into co-operative societies. Why does he hesitate? The moment he takes them in as members, he has to supply them yarn and production will go up and the accumulated stocks will increase. He is more vociferous than anybody else in urging the creation of a definite market. It is suggested that the Government should purchase these products. What can the Government do after buying them unless people will buy them, unless we have a definite market wherein these products could be sold? Difficulties arise not because of the defects in the handloom weavers' organizations, but because of the conflict with mill products. If we make the reservation, then it is the duty of the Government of the State to look into these matters also. It is only if we create a market, these co-operative societies can flourish and grow and absorb more and more weavers.

"The position with reference to yarn has been already explained. Hon. Members who have studied this subject closely have spoken on this aspect. We have said in the Resolution that the entire yarn that is needed for producing the cloth which we want to be reserved should be made available thereafter for the handloom weavers at a fair and reasonable price. The reason for this is that the conflict itself has resulted in the extra and higher price of foreign cotton being thrown as a burden on the handloom industry. We want that this should be avoided and so we have introduced a definite clause in the Resolution to that effect.

"Sir, I have studied the amendments that have been moved. Many of them are good and are intended to improve the administration in this State. They do not really form part and parcel of the issue of policy behind the present Resolution. The present Resolution is, so to say, a battle for the creation of a market. As for other things, they have to be and will be considered by the Government. I would like hon. Members to remember that if these amendments are introduced in the present Resolution, the result will be confusion of issues and it will make our difficult battle more difficult. We must go with clear issues and it will be the duty of the Government to see that what is necessary is done in the other respects referred to. We have asked for a fair price for the yarn supplied and we shall certainly demand adequate quantities. There is nothing to be gained by introducing words such as a 'first charge on the total production of yarn in the country' as was demanded by hon. Member Sri Kotaiah.

"My communist colleagues in the Assembly, I may be permitted to say, are suffering from an inherited complex in favour of

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

machine products. They cannot easily get out of that, though they are wonderfully alert and flexible in many matters. They find a certain difficulty in changing over from the creed of machine production. Hence they have brought in a number of amendments in spite of their full support to the main principle of the resolution. They have concentrated on what this Government have not done and what this Government are not going to do and things like that. They have said that the purchasing power of the people should be raised; that the disease is there and not in the conflict of the mill industry. This is a totally wrong conception. The conflict of the mill product with the handloom industry is a reality, a very great reality, and it has got to be got over. As regards the purchasing power of the people, it affects everything and how can we increase the purchasing power if we allow six million families in India to be unemployed! Suppose we take Madras. There are one million families here. If we allow them to be unemployed or so employed that they cannot sell the product of their profession, how can we improve the general purchasing power? Sir, this talk about increasing the general purchasing power by making agrarian reforms and the like has nothing to do with the present problem before us. There is no use mixing it up simply because, so to say, we have inherited certain complexes and ideas in respect of different subjects. I have no objection to these ideas. But they should not be brought into a discussion of this kind. Here happily I find, whatever the causes may be, that all sections of the House have given support to this resolution and I think that it is a great gain for those who have to struggle in this matter. I say 'struggle' because, I confess, Sir, the battle has been very difficult. The Government of India, though they have understood the position, find a certain conservative difficulty in making a big change of this kind by accepting a proposal of protection in this regard."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—"What is the opinion of the Tariff Board?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I may say that not only the Tariff Board but every one including the Planning Commission appreciates our position. The difficulty, however, is one of taking a step. Such difficulties are natural. In the old days, when the mill industry of India had to struggle against the foreign mill industry importing goods here, there was protection and that protection was given by the British Government then. It was enjoyed all the time by the mill industry here and we should keep that example in mind in an internal matter like this. I am, therefore, grateful to the House for the support it has given to Government. Let it be understood that I am claiming no originality for this proposal. My name (Rajagopalachari Garu) came up in many Telugu speeches. I am claiming no originality in this matter. All that I want is that the handloom weavers should be saved from distress by being given a little help in their own self-endeavour. The mills enjoyed great protection for a long time at the cost of the consumer, as all people know. I am certain, I may say, that if there had been no unfortunate controversy raised over

4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

the matter, I could have brought the industrialists to agree to this very reasonable proposal. I have not much doubt in the matter because mill industrialists have got a wide field. They can look after themselves and it is possible to bring them round. But it has become difficult just now on account of the developments that have taken place. I can assure the mill industry in the course of this debate that it will not stand to lose anything if the industrialists concede what we have asked for now.

"I hope, Sir, that the amendments will not be pressed, for the main reason that I have given, namely, that it will complicate the issue and make it difficult to go through and it may also weaken our case because specious arguments can be put forward such as 'You have not set your house in order; you have not done this; you have not done that and you have not helped them this way or that way'. Let us understand one another. I want that the duties of this Government should be separated from what we are asking now at the hands of the Government of India. Let us do what we have to do. Let us discuss and do what we must do immediately, namely, to secure the primary thing—this particular reservation—and when we get this reservation, the Government will be at the disposal of this House for discussing whatever other measures may have to be taken. Let us not confuse the issue with amendments of this kind. I hope, Sir, therefore, that my Friends will not press their amendments and give unanimity a wrong turn, so to say, of difference of opinion and that this resolution will get through with the same unanimity that it obtained at the beginning of this debate. The main policy has to be presented to the Government of India. That is what we have to press for.

"Sir, there was some reference to certain points such as import of foreign products and the like. Let me give facts. The total import for the whole year in this State of Madras of foreign cloth is 200 bales at the present moment. This import does not affect the present question at all. The figure is nothing and the cloth is mostly imported for the making of umbrellas.

"Reference was made to sales tax. The sales tax on handloom products is one and a half pies or one-eighth of an anna per rupee at a single point only. But the tax on mill-made cloth is quarter anna per rupee, multipoint. Let us not draw a red herring across the trail here. It has nothing to do with the present question. And as for Khadi, there is no tax. That is well-known.

"I think, Sir, I have dealt with the amendments and as my Hon. Colleague is not going to speak after me, I make the appeal that the amendments may kindly be withdrawn and that this resolution may be left to its fate without any confusion of issues." (Loud cheers.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is any hon. Member withdrawing his amendment?"

(All the movers of amendments except Sri P. Kotaiah declined to withdraw their amendments and their amendments were put to vote.)

[4th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add at the end the following :—

" This House is also of opinion that since the existing Handlooms in Malabar are such that they cannot utilise the advantage of the proposed measure of ' reservation ' to the full, the Government shall take necessary steps to help the industry to instal suitable looms and other help to those of the Handloom owners who actually deserve it, so that the existing unemployment and the consequent hardships be eradicated to some extent. (Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiyar.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add at the end after the words " imported cotton " the words " and also to reduce the price of the yarn " .

' Add at the end the following :—

" This House is also further of opinion that the Central Government should immediately constitute Purchasing Boards for handloom cloth and find ways and means to secure markets for the handloom cloth and urgently take steps to open gruel centres wherever it is necessary in Madras State out of the Central Relief Fund so as to save the life of so many unemployed weavers. (Sri K. P. Gopalan.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" This House is further of opinion that the Central Government and Government of Madras should take steps to make available for the Handloom Industry, yarn at production price. (Sri P. Venkateswarlu.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" This House also recommends to the Government that steps should be taken—

(a) to take over the entire accumulated stock by the Government for disposal;

(b) to order the clothing needs of hospitals, Government offices, Local Boards, Municipalities, Railways, etc., from the Handloom production;

(c) to allot a sum of Rs. 2 crores as was in practice prior to 1947 for granting subsidy to Handloom Industry, every year until the industry regains prosperity; and

(d) to ban imports of all foreign textile goods. (Sri M. Kalyanasundaram.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

4th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' The words " a stable " in line 2 of the resolution shall be omitted, and after the words " dhoties and sarees " at the end of the first sentence *insert* the words " for one year ". (Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan). '

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' *Add* the following at the end of the resolution :—

" This House also strongly recommends that the steps suggested above are temporary and the permanent solution for the problem of Handloom industry, the other handicrafts and trade lies in increasing the purchasing power of the peasantry, constituting 80 per cent of the population through proper agrarian reforms and in a better co-ordinated plan between supply and demand and the supply through the Mills and handicrafts. (Sri K. Venkaiah). ' ' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will now put the amendment of hon. Member Mr. Jeevanandam to vote. The question is— 3-50 p.m.

' In the second sentence after the words " Yarn spun out of Indian Cotton " *add* the following :—

" at prices which prevailed in 1947. ' ' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member Mr. Kotaiah pressing his amendment? "

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH :—" If the Madras Government will press for adequate supplies of yarn for the handlooms I will not press my amendment. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member withdrawing his amendment or not? "

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH :—" I am not pressing my amendment, Sir. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" It means he is withdrawing the amendment. I hope the House gives permission to the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment. "

The amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member Mr. Seetharamiah withdrawing his amendment? "

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" I press the amendment, Sir. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' *Add* the following at the end :—

" This House also recommends to the Government that the following measures be taken in addition :—

(a) To absorb all handloom weavers into co-operative societies paying the share capital in famine affected districts such as Chittoor, Cuddapah, Anantapur, etc.;

[Mr. Speaker]

[4th November 1952]

(b) to abolish sales tax on the sales of handloom cloth;

(c) to grant subsidies to this industry by subsidising the yarn price till it regains stability;

(d) to ban all foreign imports of textile goods;

(e) to use handloom cloth in all departments of the Government, so that a large stock may be consumed by the Government; and

(f) to institute a technical committee to improve the productive capacity of the handloom industry at a lower cost." "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Now I will put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ This House emphatically supports the view of the Government of Madras that in order to provide a stable market for the important and widespread cottage industry of handloom weaving on which, in this State alone 4½ millions of men and women subsist, the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees should be reserved to the handloom industry and that mills and power looms should not be permitted to weave such dhoties and sarees. This House is further of opinion that the Central Government should take steps to make available for the handloom industry sufficient quantities of yarn, and in respect of counts of 40 and below, yarn spun out of Indian cotton so as not to burden the handloom industry with the higher price of imported cotton.’ ”

The motion was carried unanimously.

V.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL^a, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, and move—

‘ That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.’

“ Sir, in this connexion I may as well make a resume of the circumstances under which this matter is coming up here. Hon. Members are aware that on the 28th August 1952, the Governor promulgated the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Ordinance, 1952. Shortly thereafter, in order to remove certain doubts which had arisen in regard to some details, the Government issued an Amendment Ordinance on the 5th September this year. Later on to ensure the validity of these Ordinances, the Government repealed them and re-enacted the provisions thereof by a fresh Ordinance issued on the 1st of October 1952, after obtaining instructions of the President in pursuance of proviso to Article 213, clause (1) of the Constitution. The Ordinance was intended to ease the strained relations between the mirasdars and the tenants and

4th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

also between the mirasdars and the customary farm-labourers called 'pannaiyals'. There was also reason to believe that out of fear of impending land reform, several mirasdars had refused to renew lease agreements with their usual tenants and had displaced them, either bringing in new tenants or cultivating the land by farm labour. The Ordinance will cease to operate on the expiration of the six weeks from the re-assembling of the legislature and it is therefore necessary to replace it by a regular Act of the Legislature. The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Bill, 1952, accordingly reproduces the provisions of the Ordinance with such consequential changes as are rendered necessary by reason of the replacement of the Ordinance by an Act. The Bill provides for the reinstatement of the cultivating tenants who were evicted by landowners either in favour of some other tenant or in favour of his own pannaiyals, that is, his farm-labourers. The Bill also provides for five years' security of tenure for the tenant and prescribes a machinery for settling disputes. It also provides a machinery for enquiring into the dismissal of farm-labourers and for their restoration on just and equitable terms if the dismissal was wrongful. Provision has also been made in the Bill for the fixation of minimum terms for the payment of 'waram' and lease rent and also minimum wages that shall be paid to agricultural labour. The Bill thus seeks to remove the causes of friction that have led to agrarian crimes and disturbances in the Tanjore district and which if allowed unchecked may lead to serious deterioration in agricultural production. Therefore, Sir, I move that the Bill be taken into consideration at once."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

'That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.'

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, namely :—

'That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members :—

(List of names to be furnished later.)'

"Sir, my reasons for moving the amendment are these. The Bill embodies a principle which in my opinion is going to be a permanent measure. Of course the Ordinance was meant to meet an emergency. But the legislation is going to be permanent. Not only that. From all parts of this State there has been a demand that the main principles of the Bill should be extended to the other areas in the State if it were to be passed into law. Here, Sir, I may say on behalf of the Opposition, that all of us wholeheartedly agree with the principle that the sub-tenants, persons who now go under the name of 'tenants at will' the tillers of the soil, the cultivators of the soil, should have a right to permanent tenure. To the extent that this Bill offers them protection,

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [4th November 1952]

at least for five years, we are wholeheartedly in agreement with the principle of the Bill. But, Sir, it does not mean that we agree with every clause in it. Many clauses may have to be improved in so far as they affect the persons who are depending on the land and who have got interest in the land.

" I may here also draw your attention to the fact that the Government themselves have had to improve the Ordinance twice. Not only that. After publication of the Bill, the Government had again to bring forward certain amendments. It may be said by the Government that they have introduced only new amendments in order to meet new criticisms and therefore a reference to the Select Committee is not necessary. But, I submit, Sir, there were many memoranda, many representations, many objections—published in the newspapers also—discussing the various aspects of the legislation. I submit, in regard to a legislation of this kind which is going to be a permanent feature, it should be made a general convention in this House that the Government should never come forward with a motion that it should be taken into consideration at once. But, only that it may be referred to a Select Committee. It is not like a Bill which the Hon. Minister Sri Sankara Reddi is going to move just to extend the life of the District Boards. Here there are principles and there are various parties concerned; and here is a case where we have to go into the detailed provisions of the Bill and also the language of the provisions. It might also be said: ' As the case is very urgent and the Government have placed this measure before the public for more than four to five weeks there is not much necessity for a Select Committee. Even then I submit there is necessity for a Select Committee to go into the details of the Bill, because there are several clauses which we may like to improve. But I may just remind the House, in the Select Committees which were appointed on the taxation Bills, as a matter of fact, although on certain fundamental principles there has been no agreement, with regard to other clauses in the Bills there was plenty of give and take, we understood each other and we did improve the measures. The Opposition co-operated with the Government and the Government co-operated with the Opposition in the matter of improving several clauses of the Bills so as to see that the tax-payer was not unduly harassed. Therefore, in regard to this measure also there will be necessity to give and take and to improve several of the clauses. After all the clauses of the Bill cannot be considered in detail and the implication cannot be understood in detail on the floor of this House, where we cannot have any ' across the table discussion '. It is a well-known fact. I, therefore, urge on all these grounds that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I want once more to assure the Government that we do not want to delay the passage of the Bill. I would suggest that the House might even fix a date before which the Select Committee might give its report. We are prepared to sit and work day and night if necessary to produce a report before the date fixed by the Government. I do not ask for a long time to consider the Bill in the Select Committee.

4th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

" But, I say no Member of the House would like the Bill to be passed without going into the Select Committee because the Bill affects the interests of not only several millions in Tanjore district, but in other districts also because one of the clauses in the Bill says that by notification the Bill could be extended to the other districts as well. There are amendments and demands coming and memoranda have been presented to the Revenue Minister and other Ministers. The possibility is there that the Bill might be extended to other parts of the State also. Therefore, I say that the Bill merits careful consideration by a Select Committee. Therefore, I move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. When my amendment is put to the vote of the House, Sir, I shall submit the names of the members of the Select Committee."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—" I second the amendment moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The original motion as well as the amendment is before the House for discussion."

* SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on this important measure with mixed feelings. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Viswanatham, said, I do welcome the principle on which this Bill has been brought forward. The measure is a very important one, though it is applicable only to Tanjore district at present. After I come here, I find several of the Members of this House belonging to other districts have not paid any attention to the various clauses of the Bill because it is applicable only to Tanjore.

" As hon. Members may be aware, Tanjore is a big district. It is a surplus district in the whole of South India. We cannot expect the same customs and usages prevailing in Tanjore district to prevail in other parts of our State. Although we agree to the principle of the Bill, as Mr. Viswanatham has said, the manner in which the Bill has been prepared, the method of application, the time at which the Bill has been introduced and the time at which the Ordinance was promulgated—all these have wrought many difficulties in the Tanjore district. One who reads the main provisions of the Ordinance, cannot fail to understand that the Bill had been drafted by those who are completely ignorant of the customs and usages which are prevalent in Tanjore district. The Bill is an important one and I shall have to deal with it in detail. I request hon. Members to try to understand what I say, so that when the Bill is extended to other districts, there will not be much difficulty in practice.

" Sir, in Tanjore district, there are three distinct systems prevailing to-day. They are, viz., the pannai, the waram and the lease systems. These three systems are exclusive of one another. Waram is one thing. Tenancy is another. Pannai is altogether different. In various parts of the district (Tanjore) each one of the systems is prevalent. Where the pannai system is in operation, the tenancy system is absent; and the lease system is not available

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [4th November 1952]

where the waram system is prevalent. As I said already, all these three systems are quite different from one another and there is a distinction from another and no identity between the customs and usages of the people under these three systems.

“ So far as the Ordinance as well as this Bill is concerned, they try to impose only one particular system in the whole district, the system being the tenancy system. Only the tenancy system and not the pannai or the lease system is sought to be introduced. Therefore, I say it is bound to create difficulties in Tanjore district because the people of Tanjore have three distinct systems of which I have made mention earlier. On the face of it, when we look at the Bill it is quite clear that the Bill confers a great boon on the big mirasdar in Tanjore district. At the same time it will create difficulties for the small mirasdar and the poor tenants. I shall explain how.

“ Prior to this Ordinance, under the pannai, waram and the lease system, the landowner was responsible for maintaining cattle manure and other capital needed for the cultivation of his particular plot of land and even there the lease-holder or the lessee or the waramdar looked to the mirasdar for providing them with all facilities required for the cultivation of the land. Now under this Bill the whole responsibility has been taken away from the mirasdar or landowner (by whatever name you may call it) and transferred to the tenant and that too at a time when the tenant is well-nigh unable to find all the facilities for the proper cultivation of the land. This Ordinance was issued at a time when the cultivation season had already commenced, when the tenant was in difficult circumstances to find out the necessary cattle and manure needed for cultivation and at a time when feelings between mirasdar and tenants had become strained due to the mirasdar refusing to lend money to the tenants to improve the fertility of the land by providing them with proper manure, cattle and necessary seedlings. When such was the tension, this Ordinance was issued. Naturally it created still more difficulties.

“ I said previously that this Ordinance has conferred a boon on the big mirasdar. The question may well be asked as to why I say so. I shall reply. It is because the responsibility for the proper upkeep of the cattle, the manure and the capital necessary for proper cultivation of the land has now been transferred to the poor tenants who are finding it very difficult to make both ends meet. If I am permitted to say, I can even say that this Ordinance has converted the mirasdar into zamindars. Whereas prior to this Ordinance, the owner was obliged to remain near his land to supervise the cultivation, now he can as well remain in a far-off place and yet demand 60 per cent of the net produce. For instance, a mirasdar may reside at Madras and demand 60 per cent of the produce from the tenants. That is the privileged position to which this Ordinance has elevated the big mirasdar. At the same time we should not forget the sorrowful plight to which the tenants have been driven.

4th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

" In the preamble to the Ordinance, it is stated that relations between the mirasdars and the tenants so far as Tanjore is concerned has become strained. The Hon. Revenue Minister also referred to this agrarian tension while moving this Bill. The Ordinance has been there for the last two months. What miracle has it produced? The agrarian tension has not been toned down. On the other hand, we find the Revenue Courts set up under the Ordinance flooded with applications from the tenants as well as the mirasdars. So, Sir, the displacement of tenants exists only in certain taluks and not in the whole of the district. For instance, in Tanjore, Pattukkottai, Arantangi and Papanasam taluks, displacement of tenants is not at all existing and from the applications filed before the Conciliation Officers, we can very well ascertain that the trouble was about the share of the produce and not about the displacement of tenants; applications under clause 6 of the Bill are very rare and on the other hand, applications under clause 13 of the Bill are many. In certain places though the relationship between the landlord and the tenant was cordial, now because of the Ordinance the relationship has become strained. My only point is that conciliation might have been more effective in certain places than the Ordinance itself. Now that the Bill has been introduced, the mirasdars and other landowners who have 2 or 3 velis say that they are greatly affected. The real agriculturist families who cultivate the land with their own labour and certain pannaiyals can certainly cultivate 2 or 3 velis to the best advantage of the country. But the people who are now working in one veli say, ' whether we work in one veli or two or three velis, the work is the same.' Therefore these tenants also claim the same rights as are given to the tenants who work in two or three velis. How are we to reconcile these two classes of people? Sir, there is another class of landlords, the absentee landlords. The Subramaniam Committee's report and the Raghavendra Rao Committee's report both say that there is no such class in Madras State as absentee landlords. When we accept this statement, nobody can be considered to be one not knowing agriculture. But the point is that there are people who own one veli of land and who are at the moment engaged in other professions and not on the spot. They live elsewhere. Now, the benefit of this Bill must be extended to those who work on lands of one veli or less.

4-10
p.m.

" Let us take another instance. A landowner gives his land to a tenant in whose ability and straightforwardness, he has got confidence. But the sons of the tenant may not like to be tillers again and they may like to pursue some other profession. In these cases they should not be burdened with the responsibility of tilling the soil. According to the Bill, a ' cultivating tenant ' or ' tenant ' is a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another, under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs of such person. It means that, if a tenant dies leaving behind him a minor girl or a minor son, that minor girl or

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [4th November 1952]

minor son is given the right to possess the land; they may not be in a position to cultivate the land and even when they become majors they may not be willing to be tillers of the soil and they may take to some other profession. In such cases, the land has to be resumed by some other tenant or the owner of the land must be allowed to cultivate the land. There is yet another class of people. Suppose I am a landowner and I have given my lands to a tenant for cultivation as I happen to be a lawyer. At certain stage, I may like to go back to my land and become the tiller of the soil. Therefore, Sir, in such cases also there must be provision for the landowners to resume the land. Even if the landowner is not willing, his son may be willing to cultivate the land and he must be permitted to resume the land. Therefore, to meet all these points sufficient provision must be made in the Bill.

" There is another point I want to say. According to the Bill, 'cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another . . . But, 'pannaiyal' means any person engaged by the landowner or by the cultivating tenant. So, only a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family is included in the definition of 'cultivating tenant' and not the pannaiyal. Therefore, pannaiyal also must be included in the definition of 'cultivating tenant', i.e., the definition must be: 'a cultivating tenant or tenant means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family or that of his pannaiyal. . . .

" Sir, there are certain other people who are neither landowners nor tillers of the soil; they are middlemen; this class of middlemen is very powerful. It is well known, Sir, that in Tanjore district, there are very many big mirasdars and devasthanams owning 400 or 500 or 1,000 acres. A particular person becomes the lessee of a particular mirasdar or devasthanam; he does not cultivate the land himself; he leases them out to so many small tenants who are not recognized as tenants. In this Bill there is absolutely no provision preventing these middlemen from becoming cultivating tenants. There are many of these middlemen in Tanjore district, because the mirasdars and the devasthanams have no confidence in the tillers of the soil and they depend on the middlemen for the payment of rent and not on the actual tillers. This is the system that is now obtaining in many places of Tanjore district. Therefore, Sir, there must be sufficient provision in the Bill to prevent these middlemen from taking advantage of this Bill.

4-20
p.m.

" Another important matter in respect of which there is no provision in the Bill is the punja land. In the Tanjore district, punja lands are peculiar; Tanjore district punja lands are quite different from punja lands elsewhere in the State. The punja lands in other places are not so valuable as punja lands in the Tanjore district, so far as I know the position in some of the other districts. Punja lands that lie along the Cauvery banks are more

4th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

valuable than nanja lands, because in those punja lands, the tenants are in the habit of growing cash crops like plantains, betels, tobacco, etc. The usual custom in these cases is that the tenant pays the normal rent to the landowner, but the tenant must be on the soil all the twenty-four hours of the day and then only he will get the full benefit out of the soil. In fact, the landowner need not pay any attention at all to the cultivation in these cases. He is paid the normal rent. But the tiller of the soil has to be on the soil all round the twenty-four hours; even during nights he will have to work. Naturally therefore, according to the system prevailing there, the major portion of the produce is taken away by the tenant, and the landowner takes only the normal rent. But now, according to the provisions of this Bill, the major portion, i.e., 60 per cent, is to go to the landowner, and so the owners of punja lands are quite happy over this Bill and it is the tenants who will be put to enormous difficulty. I submit therefore that some suitable provision should be made in order to see that the tenant who is there on the soil all the twenty-four hours of the day is allowed to reap the full benefit of his labours.

" The next point I wish to refer to is this : At present exemption is given to lands less than one veli. Supposing a man with one veli of land leases it out to a particular tenant saying that the land belongs to him and he is in enjoyment of the property. The tenant naturally is not expected to verify the title deeds or the extent. This has been the case up to now; but under the provisions of this Bill, the landowner can go to the Conciliation Officer and say ' I am entitled only to six acres and five cents, and not more than that; the rest of the land belongs to the temple, or to my wife or to my minor children ' and so on. He may even produce evidence to show that it is the case and claim that the whole extent of the land should be exempted. In such a case, even the tenant may be the same person and yet the land may be said to belong to more than one person. I therefore suggest that the relevant clause of the Bill should be suitably altered; otherwise, many tenants will be put to considerable difficulties by the landowners, who will naturally take advantage of the present provisions.

" Another important aspect of the Bill I wish to refer to is this : At present, Conciliation Officers have been appointed whose duty it is to interpret the various provisions. Such officers mostly have been drawn from the Revenue Department. I doubt very much whether they are able to understand the provisions. We are told that the Civil Procedure Code is applicable to such cases. We all know that the Civil Procedure Code has been differently interpreted by different Courts—the munsif's court, the sub-court, the High Court and in some cases even by the Privy Council. When such is the case, ordinary officials drawn from the Revenue Department who have been appointed as Conciliation Officers, cannot be expected to give a correct interpretation of the provisions. Especially when we are told that the revenue court's authority is final, my submission is that there should be some tribunal or some other

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [4th November 1952]

appellate court in order to check errors in the decision—which is but natural. There must be some authority to be appealed to in case of irregularities or hasty and wrong decisions by the revenue courts. Even for the posts of Conciliation Officer, persons who have got a legal knowledge may be appointed.

“ One other matter about which I find there is no provision in the Bill is : We say that the cultivating tenant should get the profit; but sometimes the cultivating tenant is himself a middleman; he may himself be a big landowner and naturally he will engage a pannaiyal to do the work and will cease to be a cultivating tenant himself. I therefore suggest that in order to cover such cases, some extent must be fixed. For instance, we may say that a man with his wife and son can cultivate 5 or even 10 acres. If we do not limit the extent, the family cannot cultivate the land properly. Supposing a person owns 20 or 30 velis of land and he comes under this Bill as a tenant in order to get the benefit of the land. In the natural course of events, we cannot expect that particular person to cultivate the land properly and we cannot expect him to produce the best results possible. That is why I say, if we limit the extent, the total production in the country will increase and it will be more than what it is to-day. One result of this will also be that the middleman's activities will be restricted and the number of people who are actually on the land will increase.

“ When we deal with the Bill clause by clause, I am quite sure we will come across many such practical difficulties. The relationship between the landowner and the tenant has already become strained and by no stretch of imagination can we take it that the old good relationship will be restored. At the same time, I really congratulate the Government on their having promulgated the Ordinance. It is a good step towards land reform and it is in that view that I congratulate the Government. One is however led to think that the tenant is being enabled to enjoy certain benefits only for a period of five years—in other words, that security of tenure is given for five years—and that this may be an attempt on the part of Government to postpone land reform for ever. If that should be the case, then I submit this is not at all a reform worth having. If, however, this is going to be a step in the direction of a thorough land reform, I am quite sure everybody will welcome it—not only in the Tanjore district, but throughout the country. I understand that people even outside our country are watching us, watching how this measure is going to work. In that aspect, this is a very important measure. We have already hastened this measure by means of an Ordinance. I therefore request the Government now not to rush it through, since it has been introduced in this House in the form of a Bill. This must be allowed to go to a Select Committee where every clause should be thoroughly examined. If it goes to a Select Committee, it can go through the clauses one by one and various necessary alterations may be made in order to overcome some practical difficulties which I have just now mentioned and which other speakers also may mention. As I said, Sir, this is an important step towards land reform, and in case this measure

4th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

is to be extended to the whole of this State, we should see to it that it is a measure which will give real benefit to the tenants. In that view, Sir, I appeal to the Government to agree to the amendment that this may be sent to a Select Committee."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" On a point of information, Sir. May I know whether the Government are going to accept this amendment or not and also may I know the time allotted for the discussion of the Bill? "

4-30
P.M.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Before I know the mind of the Government, I shall not be in a position to say whether the Government are going to accept the amendment or not. So far as the Chair is concerned, the Chair will allow more time so that the Government might judge from the trend of the speeches what they could do best."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" We will try to hear a little more before we come to any definite conclusion upon that question."

* SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is with very great pleasure that I rise to support the measure brought forward by the Hon. the Minister for Revenue in regard to the relationship between the landowners, I may call them the ryots or mirasdars, and the tenants of the Tanjore district. I submit that it was a timely measure that was brought by our revered Rajaji; it was a time when there was a loud clamour in the district of Tanjore about mass evictions. It was reported on the floor of the House by several hon. Members of the Opposition and even by some hon. Members on this side of the House, particularly some Harijan Members that there were tens of thousands of evictions by rich mirasdars and matadhipatis in Tanjore district. There was a loud clamour about that and when I had occasion to refute it, I did it in a way though I had not the hardihood to refute it wholesale because it was true to some extent but not to the extent that they made it out to be, which was exaggerated by several hon. Members of the Opposition. At a time when there were evictions, say about some thousands, I might even put it at some hundreds, not in all the taluks of the district—there are eleven taluks in the district but in three or four taluks, I think, Shiyali, Mayuram, Kumbakonam and some portions of the other taluks—I may say to the credit of my Constituency and to the Revenue Division from which I come, there is absolutely no such trouble, I mean Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks and I will even tack on Tanjore from which my hon. Friend Sri Swayamprakasam comes—this trouble seems to have arisen some years back and as a result of it there was the Mayuram agreement. But in 1952 when troubles started, I remember distinctly that the Tamil Nad Congress Committee deputed Sri R. Venkataraman, M.P., the Congress Labour leader, to visit the affected areas. Accordingly Sri Venkataraman in the company of Sri Narayanaswami Nayudu, who in season and out of season has been voicing the feelings and grievances of the tenants of the district on the Congress side toured

[Sri S. Venkatrama Ayyar] [4th November 1952]

the affected areas and they found out the actual position obtaining there and they promptly reported the facts to the T.N.C.C. At a time when the matter was being discussed on the floor of the House at the instance of the hon. Sri Narayana-swami Nayudu and several of us, we acquainted our revered Rajaji with the situation in the district and he at once assured us that he would look into the matter very closely and bring forward some suitable legislation. Of course, he did not mention about an Ordinance or about a Bill; he assured us that he would bring forward some legislation and try to ease the situation so that the food production may not be affected and the relationship between the ryots and the tenants may not get strained, because Tanjore district is a district which supplies food to the other districts and strained relationship between the tenants and the ryots should not be allowed to continue. It is in that background that the Ordinance was promulgated by our Chief Minister and hon. Members may remember that just on the eve of the promulgation of the Ordinance, our Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. the Finance Minister happened to tour Tanjore district. With great strain of old age, our Chief Minister came to Tanjore and he went to Tiruturaipundi and almost all the affected areas including Tiruvarur and if only some of the Members here who are on the other side been there they would have seen the large congregations and witnessed the enthusiasm that prevailed wherever the Hon. the Chief Minister addressed meetings, meetings of not only mirasdars but of meetings attended by tenants in thousands. Tiruturaipundi, hon. Members must know, is famous, I may even call it, notorious as the stronghold of the Opposition parties, but even at that place, in Tiruvarur, in Shiyali, large congregations assembled to greet him, not only for greeting and respecting our leader but also they welcomed the Ordinance. In Tanjore when he addressed a mass meeting of the mirasdars, several representations were made to him about several difficulties that arose as a result of the enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance and he said that he would look into them and try to rectify them. He wanted to establish cordial relations between the mirasdars and the tenants so that the food production will not be affected. Some mirasdars pointed out that they were not given any share of the catch crops as they are called—we commonly call them உஞ்சுறு and பஞ்சுறு : hitherto they were getting half out of it but they were not allowed anything under the Ordinance. Immediately the difficulty was pointed out, he understood the position and he has remedied it and he has awarded forty per cent to the mirasdar and sixty per cent to the tenants and he has also put a limit upon the portion of the land to be cultivated so that the tenants may not put the entire stretch of land under catch crop in order to get greater benefit. There were certain other difficulties pointed out by mirasdars as well as by tenants and he has said that the difficulties would be remedied.

“ Sir, so far as this Bill is concerned, it clearly gives fixity of tenure. There is some sort of opposition from mirasdars on the ground that though the Government have done away with the

4th November 1952] [Sri S. Venkatrama Ayyar]

intermediaries by abolishing the zamin and inam estates and converting them into ryotwari lands, they want to create some sort of occupancy tenure in the ryotwari land. This is the representation that most of the mirasdars in Tanjore district have made. I may submit for the information of the hon. Members and for the satisfaction of the mirasdars in my district that it is not so. It is only a sort of tenure for a period of five years on the distinct understanding that they should pay, regularly and promptly without any delay, the *varam* due, that is 60 per cent as is provided in the Bill, to the mirasdars. So long as the mirasdar gets it, he must naturally remain satisfied. Of course if there is no payment, there are other penal provisions in the Bill to look after such cases. So much so, it is not a question of creating another sort of tenure in the ryotwari land. The very principle underlying the abolition of zamin and inam estates is that there should be no intermediaries and there should be one uniform tenure in the entire Madras State and that tenure is ryotwari tenure.

“ As has been referred to by my hon. Friend, Mr. Swayamprakasam, it is a fact that in Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks there are not many applications before the Conciliation Officer as is provided in the Bill. But, at the same time it must be understood that Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks comprised about 90 per cent of zamin and inam villages which have been converted into ryotwari tracts after the passing of the Estates Abolition Act. Just before the passing of that Act, there was the Tenants' and Ryots' Protection Act which gave protection against eviction to the tenants who were cultivating the private lands of mirasdars. Even that Act came into force when tenants were about to be evicted by inamdars. By virtue of that Act which was passed by the last Congress Ministry, tenants could not be evicted so long as they were paying the rent due to mirasdars. Now that the Zamindari Abolition Act is in force, there is no necessity for that Act also. What is obtaining in Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks is that in most cases there is cordial relationship existing between tenants and mirasdars. If there is trouble, applications either on behalf of tenants or mirasdars will be filed before the Conciliation Officers. Therefore, there is no point in saying that the Bill has no effect, so far as some taluks of Tanjore district are concerned. The Bill is concerned mainly with the root cause of the matter, viz., that there is some strained relationship between tenants and mirasdars in Tanjore. We are not concerned whether it is in the C.M.P. area or in the old delta area. Sir, the prosperity of several other districts in the Madras State completely depends upon the prosperity of the Tanjore district. If the relationship between mirasdars and tenants is cordial and if food production is speeded up in Tanjore district, there will be prosperity in other districts also. And it is only in view of that and also finding that the relationship is strained and also in view of the incessant representations made by Mr. Naravanaswami Naidu, myself and Congress legislators from Tanjore district, the Hon. Chief Minister assured us that he would bring forward some suitable legislation and this Bill is the result of such a representation.

[Sri S. Venkatrama Ayyar] [4th November 1952]

If there is some minor defect here and there as has been represented by several mirasdars from Shiyali and Kumbakonam and other parts before our Hon. Chief Minister recently, the Hon. Chief Minister will look into the matter and the defects will be remedied suitably in conformity with the need for cordial relationship between tenants and mirasdars. The very fact that several hon. Members representing constituencies in districts other than the Tanjore district wanted that this Bill should be extended to other districts, clearly shows that benefits are actually conferred on the Tanjore tenants. When once this Bill becomes an Act and is placed on the Statute Book, we will be in a position to know the working of this Act. After a successful working of this Act in the Tanjore district, the Government will certainly extend the provisions of this Act to other districts and the benefits will flow to other districts of the State so that the entire agricultural operations of the Madras State will flourish and the food production will naturally increase and all will prosper. So, I wholeheartedly support the Bill that has been brought forward by our Hon. Minister for Revenue and I hope the entire House will pass the Bill."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లు విషయములో నేనునాథావాలను స్పష్టంగా ప్రకటించవలెనంటే నేను తెలుగులోనే మాట్లాడవలసివస్తుంది. అందుకు మీరు ఆవ్యధాధావించరని తలుస్తాను. వచ్చి, రానీ ఇంగ్లీషులో మాట్లాడవలెనంటే నాథావాలను స్పష్టంగా తెలుగులోనే చెప్పి లేమంచిదని భావిస్తున్నాను. ఇక ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క object గురించి విచారిచివట్లయితే, ఈ బిల్లుకు తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ప్రత్యేకమైన ఆత్మవసరమైన పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడాయని, అక్కడ రైతులకు భూకామందులకు చాలా విపరీతమైన బేదాధిప్తాయాలు, కష్టాలు ప్రబల ఆశాంతి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడాయని కాబట్టి ఆత్మవసరముగా ఈ ordinance తీసుకొనిరాబడినదని బిల్లు యొక్క ప్రధాన ఆశయములలో ఇది ప్రధానముగా కరిగిపోయినది. ఈ ఒక్క అంశముమీదనే ఆలోచిస్తే ఒక విషయము మాత్రము స్ఫురణకు వస్తున్నది. ప్రభుత్వము ఇటువంటి సమస్యల విషయములో పరిస్థితులు, ప్రజాభిప్రాయాలు, ప్రజావసారాలుగురించి ముగిసి పరిస్థితులు వివరించకముందే ప్రజాస్వామిక సిద్ధాంతాలనుసరించి పరిస్థితులు చక్కచెట్టుతుకు పూనుకొనుటలేదని స్పష్టపడుచున్నది. అక్కడ ఆత్మవసర పరిస్థితులు ఏ విధముగా వచ్చాయని తెలుస్తున్నదంటే అక్కడ భూభామందులు రైతులు ఒకరినొకరు కొట్టుకొంటున్నారని, బుర్రలు పగులకొట్టుకొంటున్నారని, ఈ కారణములనే ఆత్మవసర పరిస్థితులుగా గ్రహించుట ఈ ప్రభుత్వవిధానముగా స్పష్టపడుచున్నదని చెప్పకతప్పదు. ఒకరినొకరు కొకరు కొట్టుకొనునంతవరకు చెబ్బలాడుకొనంతవరకు ఆత్మవసర పరిస్థితులుగా ఈ ప్రభుత్వదృష్టిలో పరిగణింపబడరని తేలుచున్నది. ఇనాములలోని రైతులకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు ఇనాము గ్రామాలలోని ఇనాము ఎస్టేట్లలో ఈ భూస్వామ్యవ్యవస్థను రైతులెక్కడ స్థిరపడుకొంటారో అనే ఆతురతతో కృత్రిమపద్ధతులలో రైతులను భూములనుండి తొలగించి నిరుద్యోగులుగా చేసినటువంటి అనేక సంఘటనలున్నాయి. ఈ సంఘటనలు ఈ నాటికి 15 సంవత్సరముల క్రింద నుండియే, అనగా 1936 వ సంవత్సరము నుండినే జరుగుచున్నవి. ఈ సమస్యను ఎన్నో సందర్భాలలో ప్రభుత్వదృష్టికి తీసుకొని వచ్చి, ఎన్నో విధాలుగా deputations రాయచా రాయి చేసినప్పటికి కూడా, ప్రభుత్వము చరితచకుండా ఉండున్నది. ఒక తంజావూరులోనే ఆత్మవసరమైన పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడిందని, అక్కడ ఒకరి నొకరు బుర్రలు పగులకొట్టుకొంటున్నారని

4th November 1952] [Sri G. Latchanna]

కాబట్టి ఆక్టోబర్ 1952లో ఆర్డెన్స్ పర పరిస్థితులు విర్వద్ధాయనే సిద్ధాంతము వి మాత్రము సబబుగా వని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఒకరినొకరు గొట్టుకొని తల వగుల గొట్టుకొంటున్న మాత్రాన, ఆక్టోబర్ ఒకచోటనే ఆర్డెన్స్ పర పరిస్థితి విర్వడింది అని అనుకోవడం చాలా పొరపాటు. ఆ ఒక్క జిల్లాలో ఈ Ordinance అమలుజరుపుతున్నందువల్ల, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో ఘోషామందులకు ముఖ్యముగా జామీందార్లకు ఉటువంటి పరిస్థితి మీకు కూడా రాబోతున్నదని తెలుపుతూ, ముందుగానే వారిని హెచ్చరిస్తూ వారికి ఒక line clear ఇచ్చిపెట్టుగా అవుతుంది. మీకు కూడా ఈ చిల్ల ఇకముందుకు వర్తింప బడుతుంది. కనుక ఈ లోగా మీరు స్వయంగా మీ హక్కులు మీరు గట్టిపరచుకోండి అనే ఒక హెచ్చరిక చేసినట్లుగా ఇది పరిణమిస్తున్నది. దీనివలన ఇతర ప్రాంతములలోని జామీందారులు, ఘోషామందులు, రైతులను ఘోషామందు తొలగిస్తూ వారిహక్కులను గట్టిచేసినట్లు వారికి ఒక మంచి అవకాశ మిచ్చినట్లుండుదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“ఇక చిల్లలోని వివరములను పరిశీలించినట్లుగానే, ఘోషామందులకు, ఘోషామందున్న వారికి మధ్యన ఒక విజంభివర్గము ఉన్నట్లుగా బోధ పడుతున్నది. ఈ మధ్య వర్గము ఎందుకున్నదో, ఘోషామందులలో ఏరికి భాగ మెంతో, వీరు చేయవలసిన బాధ్యతలేమిటో, నా బుద్ధికి తోచినవరకు, నేను గ్రహించగలిగినంతవరకు నాకాత్యము కావకము లేదు. ఈ మధ్యవర్గానికి భాగమెంత, వీరు చేయవలసిన విధులు ఏమి ఈ మధ్యవర్గము ఇకముందు కూడా ఉంటుందా లేదా అని స్పష్టముగా చెప్పబడలేదు. ఈ విషయాలన్నీ vague గా ఉండలేదు. ఇక ఈ చిల్లలో రైతుకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వడానికి ఏమి చేసినారంటే, దున్నే రైతులకు ఆ ఘోషామందు దున్నేందుకు 5 విండ్లవరకు హక్కు ఇవ్వబడినది. ఈ హక్కును ఆంగీకరించుటకు మీకు ఎంతవరకు ఆధ్వర్యతరము లేదు. కాని, ఈ చిల్లలోని మిగతా ఆంశములు గమనించినట్లయితే, ఈ Ordinance ను మిరాసీదార్ల Ordinance అని చెప్పక రక్షించు. ఎందువల్లనంటే, మిగతా ఆంశములు చాలా భాగము మిరాసీదార్లకు సహాయకరముగా ఉన్నవి. ఘోషామందులలో కూడా ఆంశభాగము వీరికి చెందనట్లు నియమింపబడినది ఆక్టోబర్ మిరాసీదార్ల రైతులనుండి బకాయాలు వసూలుచేయడానికి, వారిని నానాబాధలు పెడుతూ నానా తగాదాలు కల్పిస్తూ, పోలీసులవద్దకు కోర్టులకు వెళ్లదూ, విక్రేయతమ కారణాలతో వారిని ఘోషామందులనుండి తొలగించడానికి నానాపయత్నాలు చేస్తూ, అందోళనపడుతూ యుంటే, అందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వము ఈ Ordinance జారీచేసి మీరు ఏమి అందోళన పడకండి, ఒక 5 నడవర్సాలు మాత్రము మీరు ఓపిక పట్టండి, తరువాత పరవాలేదు. ఘోషామందులలో కూడా మీకు ఎక్కువ భాగాన్ని అయిదంటి మూడు భాగాలు ఇస్తున్నాము. కనుక ఈ ఆయిదెండ్లలో మీ రేమీ ఇందులో జోక్యము కలుగజేసుకోకండి అని చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఇందులో ఒక tenancy 5 విండ్ల fixation తప్ప tenancy కు ఉరవిధమైన protection, రక్షణ కనపడం లేదు. కనుక ఒక tenancy 5 విండ్ల fixation అన్న మాత్రాన ఇది Tenancy Protection Bill అని అనుపించుకొన తగదు. ఇందుకు బదులు దీనిని Tenancy and Mirasidars Protection Act అని అనడం ఎక్కువ సబబుగా ఉంటుందని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. తరువాత, అదాయములోని ఆయిదంటి మూడు భాగాలు ఘోషామందులకు చెల్లించవలసినది కూడా అన్యాయముగా ఉంది ఇదివరకు ప్రభుత్వము నియమించినటువంటి ముద్రామణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోను, ఘోషామందున్న వారికి 50 పర్సెంటు ఉండాలి అని అన్నారు. ఘోషామందులకు 45 పర్సెంటు చెందేట్లు అవకాశ మివ్వాలి. అంతకుపైన

4-50
p.m.

[Sri G. Latchanna] [4th November 1952]

ఇచ్చట న్యాయముకాదని అన్నారు. ఈ మాదిరి ప్రభుత్వము తాము నిర్ణయించినటువంటి ఈ సుబబిణ్డం కమిటీయొక్క రిపోర్టును ఒక ప్రక్కన ప్రకటిస్తూ, రెండవ ప్రక్కన ఈ Ordinance జారీచేస్తూ, అయిదింటి మూడు భాగాలు అదాయము మిరాసిదార్లకు ఇవ్వవలెననుట ఆశ్చర్యంగా ఉంది. ఇది tenants కంటే మిరాసిదార్లకే సహాయకరముగా ఉంటున్నది కాబట్టి ఇది Mirasidars Protection Bill అగునే కాని Tenancy Protection Bill కాదని నేను మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ప్రస్తుత ప్రకాశం గారు చెప్పినట్లు principle పైన tenancy ఇన్ని విల్లని fix చేయబడిన ఆంశము తప్ప మిగత ఆంశాలన్ని tenants కు ప్రతిక్షాళముగా ఉన్నాయి. రైతులకు, మీకు 5 ఏండ్లవరకు గ్యారంటీ ఇచ్చినాము. ఈ అయిదేండ్లు మీరు బాగా దున్నుకొని వుండించుకోండి అని చెప్పాము, మిరాసిదార్లకు ఈ 5 ఏండ్లు మీరు ఓపిక పట్టండి. ఇందులో మీరు ఏ జోక్యము చేసుకోవద్దండి, మీరు అంబోళనవడ ఆక్కరలేదు అని ధైర్యము చెప్పుతున్నారు. అందువలన దీనిని తప్పకుండా ఒక సెలెక్టుకమిటీకి వేసి, వారు వృథా కాలయాపన చేయకుండా, ఈ శాసనసభా సమావేశము ముగియ లోగానే ఈ సెలెక్టుకమిటీవారు అన్ని విషయములు తుదిగా పరిశీలించి అందులోని మంచిచెడ్డలు తెలియచేసేటట్లు చేయవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇది Ordinance కాబట్టి ఇది త్వరగా Bill గా జారీ అగునట్లు చేయవలసి యుండునని, లేకపోయిన ఇది క్రమబద్ధంకాదని, రాజ్యాంగానికి విరుద్ధమనే కారణంతో ఈ Ordinance ను యథాతథంగా Bill గా మార్చుకుండా, వెంటనే ఒక సెలెక్టుకమిటీని నియమించి వారు ఏ మాత్రము కాలయాపన చేయకుండా దీనిని పరిశీలించి దీనిలోని మంచిచెడ్డలు తెలియ చేసేటట్లు చేయవలెను. కనుక దీనిని సెలెక్టుకమిటీకి refer చేయడం ధర్మమని, విధియని నేను మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when I stand to speak on this Bill, I am reminded of an experience which I once had on the Calicut railway station platform. I saw a porter cleaning the frontage of the First and Second-class Waiting Room, a few feet in width right across the platform. Immediately he had done his job, the dust and leaves from the remaining portion of the platform were blown over this spot and the whole thing became dirty again. After one or two more attempts he gave up the job. When I think of this legislative measure I am reminded of that porter who wanted to clean the frontage of the First and Second-class Waiting Room without cleaning the whole platform. Sir, the Government seldom tackle the problems at their very root and the measures they adopt are patchy and superficial. Let it be remembered that time is the essence of reform. The same reform which may satisfy the people to-day may not satisfy them to-morrow. It is not as if we are unable to diagnose the disease but we are not bold enough to apply the remedy. Sir, there cannot be any two opinions as to what our urgent problem is. This is what the authors of the Draft Five-year Plan have observed :

‘In its significance the land problem overshadows all other problems. In the measure in which a satisfactory answer can be found to this problem, the economy as a whole will advance.’

Do the Government bestow on this important agrarian question the attention which it deserves? Our experience is otherwise.

4th November 1952] [Sri M. Narayana Kurup]

Thousand and one excuses are trotted out either to evade or to postpone the problem. The same old hackneyed arguments advanced by the foreigners are advanced in a less convincing manner, nay, it has become the fashion of the Government—that be to paint those who advocate radical agrarian reforms as ‘pink’, if not ‘red.’ Even such disciples of Gandhiji as Dr. Kumaramma are looked upon with disfavour because of their views on agrarian questions. I do not know what the Government would say about Vinobhaji and his new movement. Certainly, veiled attacks are already appearing and, I believe, the time will not be far off when he will be accused of preparing the ground for a Communist upheaval. I can only repeat the warning which he has given. He says:

‘It is not the persons who advocate agrarian reforms and land distribution that invite communism but those who oppose them’.

“Sir, this Bill which is before us, is a typical example of a 5 p.m. half measure. Now, what are the fundamentals of a tenancy question? It is nothing but fixity of tenure and fair rent. Does this Bill, in any way, find a satisfactory solution for these two important questions which are implied in any tenancy problem. We are to-day in advancing times. The meaning of ownership or proprietorship is itself changing. This is what the Agrarian Reforms Committee has stated: ‘The idea of proprietorship in which the owner could use or misuse land as he likes is incongruous with the economic and social needs of our times.’ Certainly, it is an accepted notion that land is a social property. Ownership or proprietorship has been described as a bundle of rights. Can anyone to-day who is claiming interest in the land claim to possess all the bundle of rights which go to make up the proprietorship or ownership? Certainly not. To-day the sticks from the bundle, as we call it, are distributed among various interests and to the extent they are distributed, the conception of that absolute ownership becomes diluted or weakened. Therefore, Sir, any Bill which tackles the question of tenancy must give weight to this new conception of proprietorship or ownership of land. But, Sir, nothing of that kind we see in this Bill before the House.

“Sir, I said that the most fundamental thing about tenancy is fixity of tenure. I have not used the word ‘occupancy’ and that too with a purpose. By fixity I only mean that so long as the tenant is in possession and so long as he pays his dues to his landlord he should not be disturbed from his possession. It was stated by the Hon. Minister when he introduced the Bill that this Bill conferred on every tenant five years period for his lease. Sir, Sri Raghavendra Rao, the Special Officer who was deputed by the Government to consider the land tenure problem in Malabar had made an important observation with regard to ‘short-term leasing.’ He observes, ‘The yield of land depends on the interest taken by the cultivator. No cultivator will take sufficient interest in land unless he is sure of holding it without unnecessary disturbances by his landlord. A short-term lessee is not interested in making any improvement on the land or in adequately manuring it.’ He again says, ‘Eviction or threat of eviction is the main

[Sri M. Narayana Kurup] [4th November 1952]

cause of the trouble of the tenant. From this scare no tenant is safe.' Nothing like this is adopted in this Bill. The five-year period can never commend itself to any tenant. Sir, it is no consolation for one who is condemned to the gallows that the execution will take place after the lapse of a few days. It is only a cruel mockery. With the sword of Damocles, namely, eviction after five years, hanging over his head, the tenant will never rest in peace and he will never improve his land. This point has been repeatedly stated by all those experienced people who had been appointed to consider our agrarian question. It has been observed more than once that you can never have optimum result from land unless a tenant is given fixity of tenure. Sir, especially in a deficit State like ours, these questions are of interest not only to the tenants but also to the State as well.

"Then, Sir, I am coming to the question of fair rent. Under the Bill three-fifths of the produce has been fixed as the landlord's share. The authors of the Draft Five-Year Plan have considered this question of fair rent and they have made this pertinent observation regarding this: 'Depending upon contribution towards cultivation to be met by the landlord, ordinarily the rent exceeding one-third value of the produce of unirrigated land and one-fourth in the case of irrigated land may be construed to be excessive.' Even the Subramaniam Committee Report have only recommended in some cases half and half and in other cases 60 and 40 per cent to the tenant and the landlord respectively. Under this Bill the tenant is entitled to only 40 per cent of the produce and the Bill also provides that all the expenses of manuring, etc., should be met by the tenant.

"I do not want to take a long time. I have dealt with only two main principles, namely, fixity of tenure and fair rent, in regard to both of which the Bill is lamentably lacking to provide relief for the tenants. I support the Motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. I hope that the criticisms made in this House will be taken due note of by the Select Committee if the Bill goes to it. I further hope that this Bill is but a prelude to far-reaching agrarian reforms in this State. It is certain that there cannot be peace or prosperity in this State or in this country unless we are able to satisfy the land-hunger of the masses to the extent to which it can be done. Sir, this is not the time for persons who want temporary results or tactical achievements. We want statesmen who act with courage and vision and who will plan to-day for to-morrow. The question before us is whether we are destined to have such leadership."

5-10
P.m.

* SRI L. C. PAIS :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the Bill and oppose the idea of the Bill being referred to a Select Committee. The reason is simple. It will delay matters. This legislation is long overdue. It is said that the man who gives quickly gives twice. The cultivating tenant has suffered far too long and now that Government have come forward with a wise measure, let there be no postponement of relief. My grievance against the Bill is of a somewhat different kind. I find from sub-clause (2) of

4th November 1952] [Sri L. C. Pais]

clause 1 that this Bill shall be deemed to have come into force in the whole of the district of Tanjore on the 23rd August 1952 and that it shall come into force in any other area in the adjoining districts in the State of Madras, on such date as the Government may, by notification, appoint. This is somewhat disappointing. I do not understand why a relief of this kind which is bound to improve the lot of the cultivating tenant in ryotwari areas should be restricted in its scope only to particular areas like Tanjore and the districts round about Tanjore. Speaking for and on behalf of South Kanara I may say that we have been agitating for tenancy legislation for the last several years. We began our agitation in 1946 and during Prakasam's regime we almost got it, but just then the Ministry went out of office. Subsequently we renewed our agitation during O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar's time and there was practically a direction from him to the Revenue Minister to go on with this legislation. There was a similar direction during the regime of Kumaraswami Raja. In spite of our efforts, relief to the cultivating tenants in South Kanara is being postponed from time to time. My plea is simple. Let the benefit of this legislation be not confined to particular districts or particular areas but be extended to all cultivating tenants in all ryotwari areas. I perfectly realise that having regard to diversity of tenures the incidence of tenures not being alike in all ryotwari areas, it may not be easy for Government to bring in one comprehensive legislation touching the entire ryotwari area. Knowing these difficulties what we have been pressing before the Government is just this minimum. Pending introduction of comprehensive legislation—you may take your own time for it—you bring in what is known as interim or stay legislation, preventing eviction of tenants and I may add, eviction of good tenants who are paying their rents regularly and in time. Now what is the objection to bringing this kind of interim legislation? So far as South Kanara is concerned, there are not less than 1,000 evictions a year—evictions through Court and evictions out of Court. Even the eviction suits during the last two or three years are about 800 a year. I am, therefore, entitled to ask whether a case has not been made out for introduction of interim legislation with a view to prevent evictions through Court.

“ Clause 10 of the Bill, says—

* No cultivating tenant shall be evicted except as provided in section 6, or unless :

(a) he has failed to pay rent within one month of the date stipulated in the lease deed or in the absence of a lease deed, within one month of the due date according to the usage of the locality or village ; or :

(b) he has done any act which is destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon : or :

(c) he has used the land for any purpose other than agriculture : or :

(d) he has sub-let the land : or :

(e) his conduct or behaviour has been such as, in the opinion of the Revenue Court, to render his continuance as a tenant on the land undesirable in the interest of good cultivation.”

“ I ask the Hon. Minister why should not the benefit of at least this one clause be extended immediately to other areas also. Legislation may be brought in, if necessary, on the model of the Rent

[Sri L. C. Pais] [4th November 1952]

Control Act. Supposing a landlord really desires the land for his own cultivation certainly he must have it. But, as long as the landlord does not require the land for his own purpose and as long as the tenant is paying the rent regularly, I ask, is there any reason why the tenant should be deprived of the land in his occupation. I wish to bring to the notice of the House that in South Kanara there is a particular tenure known as the Chalgeni tenure. It is really tenancy at will. The tenant executes a lease deed every year in favour of the landlord. The tenant, as a matter of fact, is on the land for several generations and yet every year he is made to execute a lease deed. And what is the lease deed he is asked to execute? It is a printed form. It is worthwhile to understand what are the terms of this lease deed. It deals first with the description of the property and everything which the tenant may have done by the sweat of his brow by labour, etc., such as buildings, trees, fields and all and everything that is found on the property is included in the lease. An excellent device. The tenant is estopped later on from contending that they are his improvements. The next clause says, 'I have no right to make improvements without your written permission and if I do any improvements without such permission, I have no right to claim their value.' When the matter goes to Court, here is a ready argument—the tenant has contracted himself out of his customary right to receive compensation for the value of the improvements made by him.

"I ask whether, in these circumstances, it could be said that the tenant has got security of tenure. Do you expect him to produce more food, and when our object to-day is to improve the condition of the common man what have we done so far, to improve the lot of the cultivating tenants? We are bringing in big schemes like Community Projects in the villages. Success of these schemes depends upon the degree of support we get from the tenants also. I ask again whether there is sufficient incentive left in the tenant to work out these big schemes and to work out the various Grow More Food schemes. The Grow More Food campaigns have so far failed because Government have not been able to enlist the sympathy of the cultivating tenant on its side. The lease lastly says that no notice to quit is necessary and at the end of the year the tenant automatically has to go out unless, of course, he is kept on for another year.

"As I said, Sir, I have been pressing this matter before the Government for the last six years and it is a matter of absolute regret that the Government have not been bestowing any attention, so far as South Kanara is concerned. My submission to the Government is that when they think of Tanjore and the districts that surround Tanjore—we do not certainly grudge relief being given to them—let them think of districts and areas where tenants have no security of tenure. When relief is sought to be given to tenants in Tanjore, let it not be denied to other tenants. Every time we ask for relief, we are told that the Government are bringing in regular tenancy legislation, and the latest argument is

4th November 1952] [Sri L. C. Pais]

"We are doing something in Tanjore; let us watch and see how it works." Does it mean that relief to other areas is going to be indefinitely postponed. The indifference that is displayed and the invidious distinction that is shown are creating havoc in the countryside. I may point out in this connection, that when the Malabar Tenancy Act was last amended, they took care to remove 32 villages out of South Kanara and tack them on to the Malabar district. By doing so relief was sought to be given to these 32 villages. What about the remaining villages of South Kanara? A common man is entitled to ask why this distinction between district and district and between parts of the same district. My last submission to the Government is that this useful piece of legislation may be extended to South Kanara also without further delay."

* SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—"Sir, in supporting the amendment I want to say a few words on the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Bill. It is really a great boon to the agriculturists as a whole. Here, the agriculturist means the cultivator. For the past so many years he was not given any security of tenure. The tenant can only occupy the land for a year and afterwards he has to receive the lease. But now under the Bill five years tenure has been given and so he can produce more on the land, because he is sure that the lands are with him during the period and he can do something more than what he was doing in past. Therefore, this Bill confers a great relief to the cultivator.

"There is no provision in the Bill to cover lessees who have taken on long-term leases, i.e., leases for three, five or six years, lands belonging to maths and the Endowments Board. When the Hon. the Chief Minister came to Shiyali, I met and asked him as to what he was going to do with such long term leases. He replied that there was no use in having middlemen and that the system of middlemen should be ended. Lessees are ready to cancel their leases provided they are given a remission of 10 per cent this year. From next year onwards, maths and endowment lands could be leased directly to the cultivator.

5-20
p.m.

"The responsibility of manuring the land is left to the tenant. He has no capital and, therefore, he cannot afford to manure the land. If the land is left without manure, the soil will lose fertility. There must be a provision to the effect that the mirasdar can manure the field and recover the cost of the manure from the tenant. If this is not possible, one-fourth of the extent of the cultivable lands may be reserved for the growing of catch crops and the remaining three-fourths extent may be reserved for the growing of green manure. If this is done, the fertility of the soil will be maintained intact.

"So far as catch crops are concerned, the produce can be divided equally between the mirasdar and the tenant as is the customary right.

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] [4th November 1952]

“ The mirasdar is forced to execute a lease deed. It is true that a lease agreement cannot stand in a court of law unless it is embodied in a legal document. The tenant as well as the mirasdar must affix their signature to the lease deed. Then only there will be mutual understanding between them. If the tenant is not made to sign in the lease deed, the object of this Bill will not be achieved.

“ As regards the wages payable to pannaiyals, two alternatives are provided. Wages can be paid either according to the terms of the Mayuram agreement or according to the two-marakkal system prescribed in the Bill. The pannaiyals do not know whether they will be paid under the Mayuram agreement or under the alternative system provided in the Bill. The existence of two systems will create confusion and will not benefit the pannaiyals. Many hon. Members of this House who have not read the Bill may not know the details of the Mayuram agreement. Under that agreement, pannaiyals get daily wages at one marakkal and women labourers at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal. For kalavadi they will be paid $\frac{1}{7}$ of the gross produce. They will also get manaikollais according to custom. Mayuram agreement is good and can be followed. Under the two-marakkal system provided in the Bill, a pannaiyal will get employment only for three or four months in a year and for the rest of the year he will have no employment. At the rate of 2 marakkals a day, the wages come to 5 kalams a month. The mirasdar can get the work done by hired labourers for 3 or 4 kalams and there will be no tendency to have a pannaiyal. Then there is no use in passing a Bill for the protection of pannaiyals.

“ If the land-owner fails to comply with the award of the Conciliation Officer, he may be called upon to pay to the pannaiyal compensation not exceeding six months' wages or Rs. 150, whichever is less. In factories and firms, only three months' pay is given as compensation to the staff. The compensation payable by the land-owner may be reduced to three months' wages or Rs. 75.

“ Under this Bill the Government want to give substantial help to the cultivator. The cultivator is born in debt, lives in debt and dies in debt. No provision is made to relieve his indebtedness. In 1937, the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari placed on the Statute Book the Madras Agriculturists Debt Relief Act. This Act relieved the indebtedness of the mirasdar, so also we must do something and at once to relieve agricultural indebtedness. Then only the cultivators will derive some benefit and we will be justified that we have done something effective to help them.

“ Most of the farm labourers have built their houses on the house-sites of their landlords. If a labourer ceases to work on the pannai of his landlord, he is evicted from the house-site. He is forced to quit the house. Just as we have given security of tenure for five years to each tenant, we must also give protection against eviction from the house-site.

“ In almost all the places, communal lands like pasture lands and threshing floors are converted into house building sites. In

4th November 1952] [Sri K. R. Sambandam]

Courtallam there was a communal land which was used by the villagers as threshing floor and pasture land for grazing their cattle. Now a house building society has taken up the land for the construction of houses. If such common lands are taken away for other purposes, there will not be pasture lands for the agriculturists to graze their cattle and they will suffer. So, the existing pasture lands and other communal lands must be kept intact.

“ With these words I resume my seat.”

* SRI S. THINAKARASWAMY THEVAR :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இங்கு வந்துள்ள இந்த தஞ்சை ஜில்லா அவசர சட்டத்தை நான் ஆதரிக்கிறேன். ஆனால் அதில் சில முக்கிய விஷயங்களைப்பற்றி சொல்லவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. உதாரணமாக இந்த தஞ்சை ஜில்லா அவசர சட்டமானது டெருத்த அளவில் நமது முதல் மந்திரி அவர்களால் செய்யப்பட்ட ஒரு அவசர சட்டம். இது மிகவும் போற்றத்தக்க விஷயம். நல்ல சமயத்தில் நல்ல முறையில் எதைச் செய்யவேண்டுமோ அதை உரிய சமயத்தில் நல்லமுறையில் செய்திருக்கிறது என்பது பற்றி நமது மதப்பிரதான குறிய முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் நாம் மிகவும் பாராட்டவேண்டும். அதிலுள்ள சில ஷரத்துக்களைப் பார்க்கும்போது இன்னும் அதிகமாகக்கூட செய்திருக்கலாம் என்பது எனது அபிப்பிராயம். உதாரணமாக மதரை ஜில்லா திருமங்கலம் தாலுகாவை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் புராதீனமாக, சுமார் 100 வருஷ காலமாக ஒரு மாதிரியான முறையில் விவசாயம் நடந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறது. நிலச்சுவான்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் ஒரு வழக்கம் நடைமுறையில் இருந்துவருகிறது. அந்த மாதிரியான வழக்கத்தை இப்பொழுது உங்களுடைய ஞாபகத்துக்கொண்டுவா விருப்புகிறேன். அங்கு என்ன விளைச்சல் விளைகிறதோ அதில் சரிபாதி பாகம் நிலச்சுவாந்தாரும் சரிபாதி பாகம் குடியானவனும் எடுத்துக்கொள்வது என்ற ஒரு வழக்கம் சுமார் நூறு வருஷகாலமாக நடைமுறையில் இருந்துவருகிறது. அந்த பிராந்தியம் ஒரு வரண்ட பிரதேசம், மானுவாரி பிரதேசம், நீர் பாசனம் கிடையாது. ஏகதேச விளைவு. நாளைந்து வருஷத்திற்கு ஒரு தடவைதான் விவசாயம் நடக்கும். அந்த மாதிரியான மானுவாரி பிரதேசத்தில்கூட இப்படி விளைச்சலில் சரிபாதி எடுத்துக்கொள்வது என்ற ஒரு முறை இருந்துவருகிறது. அதைப் போலவே இப்பொழுதும் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அங்கு அப்படி இருக்கும்போது நீர்பாசனம் உள்ள காவேரி பாசனத்தில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் 40 சதவிதம் விவசாய குடியானவனுக்கும் 60 சதவிதம் நிலச்சுவானுக்கும் என்று ஏற்படுத்த இருப்பது மிகவும் போற்றத்தக்கதுதான். எங்கள் தேசத்தை ஒப்பிட்டுப் பார்த்தால் விவசாயம் செய்யும் குடியானவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் தாராளமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம் என்பது தான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம்.

“ அது மாதிரியும் அல்ல. எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் விவசாயம் செய்யும் காலத்தில் முதலாளிகள் விவசாயம் செய்யும் குடியானவர்களுக்கு தாராளமாகப் பணம் கொடுத்து உதவுகிறார்கள். அத்துடன் உரம் செய்ய தக்க உதவியும் செய்து வருகிறார்கள். அது மாதிரியும் அல்ல. தண்ணீர் இரைக்கும் காலத்தில் குடியானவனுக்கு தண்ணீர் இரைப்பதில் எவ்வளவு செலவாகிறதோ அதில் பாதிச் செலவை நிலச்சுவான் கொடுத்து உதவி வருகிறான். இந்த முறை எங்கள் பிராந்தியத்தில் நடந்துவருகிறது என்பதை இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். இவ்வித நிலைமை இருக்கும் பிராந்தியத்தில்கூட நிலச்சுவான்களுக்கு இவ்வளவு சலுகை கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை. எங்கள் ஜில்லாவைப்பார்த்து தஞ்சை ஜில்லா குடியானவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் கொஞ்சம்கூட தாராளமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம். பெரிய நீர்பாசன பிராந்தியத்தில் அதிலும் காவேரி தீரத்தில் இவ்வளவு கொடுப்பது போதாது. இன்னும் தாராளமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம். இப்பொழுது நிலச்சுவான்களுக்கு 60 சதவிதம் கொடுப்பதைக்கூட பாராட்ட வேண்டியது தான். 40 சதவிதம் கொடுப்பது என்பது பாராட்டவேண்டியதில்லை.

[Sri S. Thinakaraswamy Thevar] [4th November 1952]

என்னெனில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு எவ்வளவு சலுகை செய்யவேண்டுமோ அவ்வளவு சலுகையும் செய்யப்படவில்லை. இன்னும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 50 சத விதிகள்கூட கொடுக்கலாம். இப்பொழுது ஜனங்களிடத்தில் ஆர்வம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. 1,000 ஏக்கர், 500 ஏக்கர் என்று பூமி தானம் கொடுக்கும் மனப்பான்மை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் பூமிதான் இயக்கத்தின் நிலைமையை ஒப்பிட்டுப் பார்த்தால் இன்னும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு தாராளமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம் என்றே தோன்றுகிறது. இப்பொழுது ஒரு பெரும் மிராசதார் சமார் நூறு ஏக்கர் நிலம்கூட கொடுக்க தயாராக இருக்கிறார். அவ்விதம் இப்பொழுது ஜனங்களிடையே மனம் மாறி இருக்கிறது. இந்த மாறுபட்ட சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் இவ்விதம் கொடுப்பது என்பது சரிதான். இந்த மாதிரியான ஒரு நல்ல திட்டத்தை சர்க்கார் கொண்டு வந்திருப்பது போற்றத்தக்க விஷயம்தான். பெருமைக்கு உகந்த விஷயம். இது இந்த இந்தியா சரித்திரத்திலேயே சரித்திர பிரசித்தி பெற்ற விஷயம்தான். இது பிற்காலத்தில் புகழ் பெற்று விளங்கும்.

“இன்றைக்கு எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் நடந்துவரும் ஒரு விஷயத்தைப் பற்றி சொல்ல வேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. எங்கள் பிராந்தியத்தில் தோட்ட விவசாயம் இருக்கிறது. அங்கே குடியானவர்கள் கிணற்றிலிருந்து தண்ணீர் இரைத்து விவசாயம் செய்கிறார்கள். அவ்விதம் இரைத்துதான் பாசனம் செய்பவென்றும். வேறு பாசன வசதி கிடையாது. அப்படி செய்யும் விவசாயத்தில் குடியானவன் மூன்றில் இரண்டு பங்கும் முதலாளி மூன்றில் ஒரு பங்கும் எடுத்துக்கொண்டுக்கிறார்கள். இந்த அவசர சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் மட்டில் இருக்கட்டும். அது எங்கள் ஜில்லாவிற்கு வந்தால் அதனால் குடியானவர்களுக்கு அதிக நஷ்டம்தான் ஏற்படும். குடியானவர்களுக்கு பாதகமும் ஏற்படும். முதலாளிகளுக்கு சாதகம் ஏற்படும். எந்த பிராந்தியத்தில் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் ஏழைகளுக்கு சாதகம் ஏற்படுகிறதோ அங்கே இதைக் கொண்டுவந்தால் போதுமானது. குடியானவர்களுக்கு எங்கே அனுசூலம் ஏற்படுகிறதோ அங்கே இதை அமுலுக்குக்கொண்டு வரலாம். இந்த சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவை விட்டு வேறு எந்த ஜில்லாவிற்கும் விஸ்தரிக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் அங்குள்ள நிலைமையை தீர் விசாரித்து புனர் ஆலோசனை செய்து விஸ்தரிக்க வேண்டும் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். இத்துடன் என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

5-40
p.m.

* SRI S. RAMALINGAM:—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இப்பொழுது சபையின் முன்பாக விவாதத்தில் இருக்கும் சட்டத்தைப் பற்றி சில வார்த்தைகள் பேச வேண்டியது முக்கியமாக இருப்பதால் அதைப் பற்றி பேச விரும்புகிறேன். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள விவசாயிகள் பண்ணையார்களைச் சும்மீக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்ட இந்த ‘பில்’ லானது விவசாயிகளுக்கு குறிப்பாக ஐந்து வருஷங்களுக்கு அவர்களிடமிருந்து நிலத்தை மாற்றிக் கூடாது என்று ஒரு அம்சம் இருப்பது மிகவும் வரவேற்கத்தக்க அம்சம்தான். நமது ராஜ்யத்தில் விவசாயிகளுக்கோ அல்லது பண்ணையார்களுக்கோ பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கக் கூடிய எந்த சட்டமும் இது வரவரக்கும் கொண்டு வரப்பட வில்லை. முதன் முதலாக இப்பொழுது இங்கு கொண்டு வந்திருக்கக் கூடிய இச்சட்டம் எதிர்காலத்தில் நில சீர்திருத்தச் சட்டத்தைக்கொண்டு வரக்கூடிய முறையில் இது இருக்க வேண்டும் என்பது தான் என் நோக்கம். நடைமுறையில் இந்த அவசர சட்டத்தில் பல இடையூறுகள் இருக்கத்தான் செய்கிறது. இந்த சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்தக் கூடிய முறையில் எந்த நோக்கத்துடன் இந்த சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்தார்களோ அது சரியான முறையில் நடைபெற முடியாமல் பல இடையூறுகளால் நடைபெற்றுக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றன. இந்த அவசர சட்டத்தினால் சேற வரும் நிலத்தை உழை கொண்டிருந்தவனிடமிருந்து நிலத்தை மாற்றப்பட்டிருந்தால் அதை திருப்பிக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று இருக்கிறது. அதற்கு கன்சிட்ரேஷன் ஆபீஸுக்கு 30 நாட்களுக்குள் மனு செய்துகொள்ள வேண்டும் என்றும் இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் இந்த அவசர சட்டத்தைப் பற்றி தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் கிராமவாசிகளுக்கு சரியானபடி சொல்லாததின் காரணமாக பல இடங்களில் நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றப்பட்டவர்கள் மனு செய்துகொள்ள வசதி ஜில்லாமல்

4th November 1952] [Sri S. Ramalingam]

இருந்திருக்கிறது. இது சர்க்காரின் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு நன்றாக தெரிந்திருக்கும் என்றே நினைக்கிறேன். கிராமவாசிகள் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தை படித்தோ அல்லது பத்திரிகைகளில் வாசித்தோ, அவசரச் சட்டத்திலுள்ள விஷயங்களை தெரிந்து கொள்ளக் கூடிய நிலைமையில் இல்லை. ஆனால் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் விவசாயிகளின் நலனுக்காகவென்று கருதிப் போட்டும் கூட தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலிருக்கக் கூடிய எல்லா கிராமவாசிகளுக்கும் சரியாக எடுத்துச் சொல்லாததின் காரணமாக பல இடங்களில் நிலத்தைப் பறிகொடுத்த விவசாயிகள் இன்று சர்க்காருக்கு அப்பீல் செய்துகொள்ள முடியாமல் போய் விட்டது. அவர்களுக்கு எந்தவிதமான நன்மையும் இதனால் ஏற்படவில்லை. இந்த விஷயம் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரியும். இதைப் பற்றி போதுமான அளவு பிரச்சாரம் செய்யவில்லை. பத்திரிகைகளில் சரியாகப் பரசரம் செய்யப்படவில்லை. ஒன்றிரண்டு பத்திரிகைகளில் வெளி வந்திருந்தும், விவசாயிகள் எல்லோரும் படித்தவர்களாக இல்லாததால் அது பலருக்குத் தெரியாது போய்விட்டது. மேலும் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தின் கீழ் நிலச்சவாந்தாரர்களால் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்டு அனாதரவாக வெளியே இருக்கும் குடியானவர்கள் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு மனுச் செய்து கொண்டு தங்களுடைய குறைபாட்டை நீக்கிக் கொள்ளலாமென்று இருந்தாலும் கூட அம்மாதிரி விண்ணப்பம் போடும்போது நிலத்தின் சரவே நம்பர் போன்றவைகளைக் குறிக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஆனால் கிராமங்களிலுள்ள குடியானவர்கள் சரவே நம்பரைப் போய் கேட்கும்போது கர்ணங்கள் கொடுக்க மறுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதைப் பற்றி ஜில்லா அதிகாரிகளுக்கு எடுத்துச் சொல்லியும், ஜில்லா அதிகாரிகள் கர்ணங்களுக்கு சரவே நம்பர் கேட்க வருகிறவர்களுக்குச் சரவே நம்பர் கொடுக்க மறுக்கக் கூடாதென்று உத்தரவு போட்டும் கூட பல இடங்களில் கர்ணங்கள் வேண்டுமென்றே தரமுடியாது என்று சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்தமாதிரி அவசரச் சட்டம் வருவது அவர்களுக்குக் கொஞ்சம்கூட பிடிக்கவில்லை. எப்படியாவது இதனால் ஏற்பட விருக்கும் நன்மைகளை அழித்துவிட வேண்டுமென்றேதான் அவர்கள் சரவே நம்பர் கொடுக்க மறுக்கிறார்கள். அதனால்தான் குறிப்பிட்ட தவணைக்குள் விவசாயிகளால் சர்க்கார் கன்சிலியேஷன் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு விண்ணப்பம் போட்டுக் கொள்ள முடியாமல் போய்விட்டது. இதை சர்க்கார் நன்றாகக் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக் கூடிய விவசாயிகளின் நிலைமை சர்க்கார் போடும் உத்தரவுகளை தாங்களாகவே படித்துப் புரிந்து கொள்ளலோ, அல்லது நகரங்களுக்குச் சென்று யாரிடம் கேட்டால் முழு விவரமும் கிடைக்கும் என்று நகரங்களுக்குப் போகலோ, பிறகு மனுக்கள் போட்டு கடைசிவரை கோர்ட்டு மூலம் போராடலோ முடியாத நிலைமையிலிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகையால் அரசாங்கமே அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய எல்லாக் காரியங்களையும் இந்தத் துறையில் செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டுமே தவிர ஏதோ கண் துடைப்பு வேலையாக யாருக்கு நிலம் வேண்டுமோ அவர்கள் கன்சிலியேஷன் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு மனுச் செய்து கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லிவிட்டது மிகவும் சரியாகாது. அதனால் விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கொஞ்சம்கூட நன்மை ஏற்படவேயில்லை.

“இதில் இன்றொரு முக்கியமான விஷயமிருக்கிறது. சென்ற வருடமும் அதற்கு முந்திய வருடமும் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்டவர்கள் அப்பீல் செய்து கொண்டால் நிலத்தைத் திருப்பித் தந்துவிடவேண்டுமென்று சட்டமிருக்கிறது. ஆனால் 1946-47-ல் இந்த மாகாணத்தில் விவசாயிகளின் இயக்கம் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்ட போதும், அதற்குப் பிறகு ஸ்ரீ சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டி தன்னுடைய விவசாய சீர்திருத்த யாதாஸ்தை சமர்ப்பித்த போதும், அதற்கும் முன்பாக J. C. குமாப்பா இந்த மாகாணத்திற்கு விவசாயச் சீர்திருத்தம் வேண்டுமென்று ரிப்போர்ட் சமர்ப்பித்தபோதும், தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள மிராசதார்கள் ரொம்பவும் தந்திரமாக வாரத்திற்கோ, குத்தகைக்கோ நிலத்தை விட்டுவிடாமல் சொந்தப் பண்ணை என்ற பெயரிலேயே வேலை வாங்கிக்கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஏதாவது சீர்திருத்தச் சட்டம் வந்துவிடுமோ என்ற அச்சத்தில்தான் அவர்கள் ரொம்ப ஜக்கிரதையாக இப்படிச் செய்துகொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். இப்பொழுதும் கூட அவர்கள் வாரம், குத்தகையென்று விடாமல் சொந்தப் பயிர்ச்செலவு

[Sri S. Ramalingam] [4th November 1952]

என்று முறையில் வைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இதன் காரணமாகவே தான் திருத்தரைப்பூண்டி தாலுகாவில் ஒரு பகுதி, பாபநாசம் தாலுகாவில் ஒரு பகுதி இவைகளில் இருக்கும் குடியானவர்கள் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு எந்த விதமாகவும் அப்பீல் செய்து கொள்ளமுடியாமல் போய்விட்டது. இதையும் சர்க்கார் நன்கு கவனிக்கவேண்டும்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக ஒரு முக்கியமான விஷயம். இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவாக உள்ள நிலச்சுவாந்தாரர்களுக்குச் செல்லுபடியாகாது என்று கண்டிருக்கிறது. அதனால் பல கிராமங்களில் மிகவும் சிக்கலான நிலைமை இன்று ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இன்றைக்கு எனக்கு இரண்டு தந்திகள் வந்திருக்கின்றன. தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் வயலூர் கிராமத்தில் கமார் நூற்றுக்கு மேற்பட்ட விவசாயிகள் கைது செய்யப்பட்டு சிறையில் அடைக்கப் பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்று தந்தியில் கண்டிருக்கிறது. ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைவாக நிலமுள்ளவர்களின் நிலத்தைப் பயிரிட்டுக் கொண்டிருந்த அவர்களுக்கு அவசரச் சட்டப் பிரகாரம் தங்களுக்கு கூலி வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டதின் காரணமாக இன்று சிறையிலிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் பக்கத்தில் வேறு ஒரு விவசாயி ஒரு வேலிக்கு மேற்பட்ட நிலச்சுவாந்தாரிடம் வேலையி லிருப்பதின் காரணமாக அவசரச் சட்டத்தின் பிரகாரம் வாரம் பெறுகிறான். கூலியை அடைகிறான். ஆனால் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவாக நிலமுள்ள நிலச்சுவாந்தாரிடம் வேலை செய்கிறான் என்பதற்காக சர்க்கார் அளித்திருக்கும் எந்த சலுகைகளுக்கும் உள்ளாகாது மிகவும் கஷ்டப்படுகிறான். வாரம் வைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்தால் இவனுக்கு 40 சதம் கிடைக்காது. பண்ணைவேலை செய்தாலும் சட்டத்தில் கண்டபடி கூலியும் கிடைக்காது. ஆனால் இரண்டு பேர்களும் செய்யும் வேலை ஒன்றுதான். அதே போல ஒரு நிலச்சுவாந்தாருக்கு ஒரு கிராமத்தில் ஒரு வேலிக்கு மேற்பட்ட நிலத்தையும், மற்றொரு கிராமத்தில் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவான நிலத்தையும் வைத்திருந்தால் அவர் ஒரு வேலிக்கு மேற்பட்ட கிராமத்தில் விவசாயிக்கு சட்டப்பிரகாரம் கூலியும், ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவான கிராமத்தில் அதைவிடிக் குறைவான கூலியையும் கொடுத்துவர வசதியிருக்கிறது. ஒரே வேலையைச் செய்பவரிடம் இம்மாதிரி ஏற்றத்தாழ்வு இருப்பதின் காரணமாகவே தான் இன்று பல இடங்களில் பல சிக்கலான பிரச்சனைகள் எழுந்திருக்கின்றன. தகரூ ஏற்பட்டபிறகு இதில் அதிகாரிகளும் ஒன்றும் செய்யமுடியவில்லை. ரெவுயூப் போர்ட்டாரும் சரியாக நடந்து கொள்ளமுடியவில்லை. இடையே போலீஸ்காரர்கள் புகுந்து தங்கள் யதேச் சாதிகாரப்படி நடத்துகிறார்கள். ஏழைகளைப் பிடித்து அடித்து தண்டிக்கிறார்கள். விவசாய இயக்கத்தை நசுக்க டலாத்தாரத்தை உபயோகப்படுத்துகிறார்கள். பல இடங்களில் இம்மாதிரி நடந்திருக்கின்றன. இன்றைய தினம் எனக்கு வந்த தந்திகளில், கணபதி, காசீம், இருதயசாயி போன்ற தோழர்கள் கைது செய்யப்பட்டு லாகப்பில் கையெலும்பு முறியும் வரை அடித்து நொறுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். சர்க்காரின் அவசரச் சட்டம் சரியான முறையில் அமையாததின் காரணமாக இன்று பல புதிய புதிய பிரச்சனைகள் எழும்பியிருக்கின்றன. நிலச்சுவாந்தார்கள் விவசாயிகளை நீக்குவதற்கு பல ஷரத்துக்கள் சட்டத்தில் சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. விவசாயி நிலத்திற்கோ அல்லது பயிருக்கோ குந்தம் விளைவிக்கக்கூடிய முறையில் நடந்து கொண்டால் அவனை வெளியேற்ற வசதியிருக்கிறது. விவசாயிகளை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்ற ரெவுயூப் கோர்ட்டுக்கு அதிகாரமிருக்கிறது. இம்மாதிரி பல குறைபாடுகள் இருப்பதை சட்டத்திலிருந்து நீக்கவேண்டும்.

“குறைபாடுகளைச் சொல்லிக் கொண்டே போனால் நிறையச் சொல்லலாம். ஒவ்வொரு ஷரத்தாகப் பார்த்தால் பல இருக்கின்றன. இவைகளையெல்லாம் நீக்கி சட்டத்தை நல்ல முறையில் ஒழுங்கான முறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு உண்மையிலேயே பயன்படத்தக்க முறையில் நாம் கொண்டு வரவேண்டுமென்றால் நன்றாக ஆலோசனை செய்து விவாதிக்க வேண்டும். அது இந்தச் சபையில் முடியாது. ஆகையினால்தான் என்னுடைய நண்டர் ஸ்ரீ தென்னேட்டி விஸ்வநாதம் பிரேரேபித்த திருத்தத்தின் படி இந்த மசோதாவை ஒரு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்பவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

4th November 1952]

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I heartily support the motion for referring the Bill to a select committee for the reasons which I shall presently submit to the House. Immediately after the promulgation of the Ordinance, there was a wave of agitation from one end of the State to the other that the tenants should have security of tenure in every district. At the same time there is apprehension in the minds of land-owners that their interests are adversely affected. Therefore, this Ordinance has created, as I submitted already, apprehensions in the minds of land-owners and tenants who are likely to be evicted under the ordinary law. So, after this Ordinance, in every district, particularly in areas where the zamins have recently been abolished, there is any amount of agitation for the extension of the principle of giving security of tenure to the tenants cultivating lands. In inam villages also there is this agitation. In the Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam districts, there are numerous inam villages whose tenures are quite different from those that are in vogue in Tanjore. There the tenants are put to any amount of difficulties by the various land-owners and inamdars. Consequently several ryots held conferences in all the districts appealing to the Government to declare once and for all fixity of tenure for the tenants so that the object of the present legislation to step up production might be achieved even in the remote and northernmost districts of our State. If the Bill is good, the extension of the principle and the provisions of this Bill to all the districts also will be good. In that case, I submit that the conditions prevailing in other districts will have to be taken into consideration, before the principle and provisions of this Bill are extended to other districts, because I find that there is any amount of divergence in the matter of payment of wages, payment and collection of rents, payment of rents, etc. So, unless the views of hon. Members who have got special technical knowledge of the conditions that are prevailing in districts to which the principle of this Bill may be extended at some time or other, are taken into consideration, I am afraid a uniform policy cannot be adopted. In the interests of the tenants as a whole, the principle of giving fixity of tenure is acceptable. But so far as payment of rents and payment of wages and other things are concerned, I submit that there should be an expert committee to go into details of the various problems confronting the land-owner, the tenant and the agricultural labourer. In our parts we do not find three-fifths of the yield being given to any land-owner. There about 50 per cent of the produce is generally given to the land-owner. Therefore, if this principle of Tanjore tenancy legislation is extended to our parts, the tenants there will be certainly put to great loss. There is also a method, a sharing system, by which only half the produce will be taken by the land-owner and half will be taken by the tenant. There are other modes of payment of rent also in those areas. Therefore, what I submit is that unless those conditions are specifically understood by the Government—that can be achieved only by referring this Bill to a select committee of this House—I am afraid that this legislation will not help in any way to relieve the distress that is now the common

5-50
p.m.

[Sri K. V. Ramesam] [4th November 1952]

feature of the tenants throughout those parts. Therefore, I request the Government to consider this aspect of the problem. I say this because there is a provision in the Bill to the effect that this legislation may be extended to other districts at any time by a simple notification in the gazette. Extension of this legislation to other parts of this State is sought to be made by notification in the gazette. There is great need for studying the conditions obtaining in the various districts, particularly in Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts, where so many types of tenures are in vogue. There are different types of leasing out lands and different methods of payment of rents. These things have to be studied by hon. Members who have specific knowledge of the conditions of those places and, therefore, I appeal to the Government and other hon. Members of this House to accept the motion to refer the Bill to a select committee of this House."

* SRI R. S. ARUMUGHAM :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, தஞ்சை குத்தகைதார பண்ணையான் சட்டத்தை கனம் ரெவின்யூ மந்திரி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறதை நான் மிகவும் மனப்பூர்வமாக ஆதரிக்கின்றேன். எல்லா தொழிலாளிகளுக்கும் பாதுகாப்பு உண்டு. ஆனால் ஒரு விவசாயியை எந்த நேரத்திலும் திடீரென்று நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றிவிடலாம் அல்லது என்னவேண்டுமானாலும் செய்யலாம். அவனுக்கு எவ்வித பாதுகாப்போ, எந்த விதமான சட்டமோ கிடையாது. முதல் படியாக இப்பொழுது இந்த சட்டசபை மூலமாக இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறதைக் குறித்து நான் மிகுந்த சந்தோஷப்படுகிறேன். விவசாயிகள் பாடுபட்டும் பட்டினி கிடக்கிற நிலையில் இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்களே தவிர, வேறொன்றுமில்லை. உணவு உற்பத்தி செய்பவனுக்கு உணவில்லை. உரிமையில்லை. இப்பொழுதுதான் ஒரு சிறிது மாற்றம் வருகிறது. அந்த நிலையிலே விவசாயிகளுக்கு இது ஒரு வரப்பிரசாதம் என்றுதான் சொல்லவேண்டும்.

“இது இப்பொழுது தான் முகலாவது வந்திருக்கிறது. இதிலே சில குறைகளோ குற்றங்களோ ஏதாவது இருந்தால் அதைத் திருத்திக்கொள்ளலாம். அதற்காக குழப்பமோ சச்சரவோ செய்யவேண்டிய அவசியம் இல்லை.

“இப்பொழுது தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்கு இந்த சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது. 1947-48-வருஷத்திலிருந்து பல விவசாயிகள் அங்கே நீக்கியிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இப்பொழுது பாதுகாப்பு இல்லைதான். அந்த நிலங்களை அந்த நிலச்சுவாந்தார்களே சாகுபடி செய்துவருகிறார்கள். சொந்தப் பயிராக வைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த நிலங்களையெல்லாம், 1947-48-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்து ஏறெடுத்த விவசாயிகளை நீக்கினார்களோ, அவர்களுக்கு, அடுத்தவருக்கு குத்தகைக்கு விட்டிருப்பதை விட்டுவிட்டு, சொந்தப் பயிர் வைத்திருக்கிறதை, அந்த விவசாயிக்கு கொடுத்துவிடலாம் என்ற நிலைமை ஏற்படுத்தினால் சந்தோஷமாக இருக்குமென்று நான் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

“அது மட்டுமல்ல; ஒரு நிலச்சுவாந்தாரின் அவ்வளவு நிலத்தையும் அவரே பண்ணை நிலமாக வைத்துக்கொள்ளலாமென்ற நிலை இருக்கிறதென்று எண்ணுகிறேன். ஆனால், ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட அளவு இவ்வளவு நிலம்தான் பண்ணை நிலமாக வைத்துக்கொள்வது என்று இருந்தால்தான் நல்லது. இல்லாவிட்டால் எல்லா நிலத்தையும் பண்ணை நிலமாக வைத்துக் கொண்டு, கூலி-ஆட்கள் மூலமாக வேலை செய்யமுடியுமென்று எண்ணுகிறேன். இதனால் விவசாயிகள் பாதிக்கப்படுவார்கள்.

“இந்த சட்டம் எல்லா நிலச்சுவாந்தாரையும் கட்டுப்படுத்தக்கூடிய அளவிலே இருக்கவேண்டியதுதான். அப்படி இருந்தால்தான் சண்டை சச்சரவு ஏற்படாமல் இருக்குமென்று நான் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

4th November 1952] [Sri R. S. Arumugam]

‘ உழுதுண்டு வாழ்வாரே வாழ்வார்மற் றெல்லாந்
தொழுதுண்டு பின்செல் பவர்.’

என்ற பாட்டு இருந்ததே தவிர, அந்தப் பாட்டின் கருத்துப்படி இருக்க வில்லை. எதிர்மாராக இருக்கிறது. நாடு நம் அடைய விவசாயி மதிக்கப்பட வேண்டும். சங்கடம் இல்லாமலிருக்கவேண்டும். தஞ் ாலூரில் மாத்திரம் தான் இந்தச் சங்கடம் இருக்கிறதென்பது இல்லை. மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களிலும் இந்த சங்கடங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அனேக இடங்களில் ‘எவிக்ஷன்’ நடந்து கொண்டதான் இருக்கிறது. அதை உடனே தடுக்கவேண்டும். மேலும் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் இதை அமுல் நடத்தி அந்த ஜில்லாவில் இது சரியான முறைக்கு வந்தபிறகு, வாரம் முதலியன விவசாயிகளுக்கு அதிகம் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய அளவில் செய்து எல்லா ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் இந்த சட்டத்தை உடனடியாகக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“ ஆனால், இதுவரையிலும் எந்தவிதமான பாதுகாப்பும், எந்த விதமான காவலும் இல்லாது எந்த நேரத்திலும் வெளியே போகச் செய்யலாம் என்ற நிலை இருந்ததை மாற்றி அவர்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளித்து, சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக நாம் வழக்கு கோருவதற்கு வற்பாடு செய்து கொள்வதற்கு அனுசூலமாக இந்த சட்டத்தை இந்த சட்டசபையில் கொண்டுவந்த நமது ரெவின்யூ மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கும் நமது தலைவர் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்கும் என நன்றியைத் தெரிவிக்கிறேன். முதலாவதாக தலைமைப் பதவியை ஏற்கும்போது, இரண்டு காரியங்களை, அதாவது ‘ஒழுக்கம்’, ‘விவசாயம்’ இந்த இரண்டையும் நான் கவனிக்கப்போகிறேன் என்று ராஜாஜி சொன்னார்கள். அந்த முறையிலே இப்பொழுது விவசாயத்தைப்பற்றி அக்கரை எடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்கள் பற்றியும், நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய பாதுகாப்பைக் குறித்தும் காவலிலும் இப்பொழுது விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய பாதுகாப்பைப் பற்றியும் கவனிக்க இது கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இது தொழிலாளர்களின் நற்கால ஆரம்பம் என எண்ணுகிறேன். இந்த அளவிலே ஒரு நல்ல சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது என்பதைக் குறித்து சந்தோஷப் படுகிறேன். இன்னும் இதில் ஒரு சில குறைகளும் இருக்கின்றன. எல்லா நிலச்சுவாந்தார்களையும் இந்த சட்டம் கட்டுப்படுத்தக்கூடிய அளவிலே செய்வது, மேலும், 19.7-48-ம் ஆண்டுத் திட்டம் விவசாயிகளை பழய நிலங்களைப் பயிர் செய்வதற்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்வது, விவசாயிக்குக்கிடைக்கும் வருமானப் பகுதியைக் கூட்டுவது போன்ற காரியங்களெல்லாம் இன்னும் இருக்கின்றன. அதை எவ்வளவாம் செய்வார்கள் என்ற நம்பிக்கையைத் தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு எனது மனப்பூர்வமான ஆதரவையும் தெரிவித்து எனது பேச்சை இத்துடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The House will now adjourn to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Wednesday, 5th November 1952.”

The House then adjourned.

VI.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

- (1) G.O. No. 2408, Public (Services), dated the 10th October 1952, excluding the post of part-time Medical Officer, Madras Electricity System, from the purview of the Madras Public Service Commission. [Laid on the table in accordance with Article 320 (5) of the Constitution.]
- (2) G.O. No. 1075, Rural Welfare, dated 25th September 1952—Amendment to Madras Cottage Industries Loans and Subsidy Rules, 1948.

[4th November 1952]

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 38 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 4th November 1952, page 100 supra.]

EXTRACT FROM THE MADRAS MANUAL OF SPECIAL PAY
AND ALLOWANCES, VOLUME I.

Class IV.

13. The following rules shall regulate the grant of allowances under the Madras House Allowance Scheme to Government servants employed in post in Madras City, provided that they actually reside in the City :—

(1) The allowances granted under these rules are 'Compensatory allowances' within the meaning of Fundamental Rule 44 and other rules bearing on the subject.

(2) The scheme will not apply to Government servants, the minimum pay of whose time-scale or whose graded or fixed pay is Rs. 60 or less, and will be restricted to the following classes of Government servants, whether they draw a special pay or not :—

(a) Government servants belonging to a regular cadre of a service normally liable to be employed either in Madras City, or in stations in the mufassal, who, if employed in the City, draw the scale of pay of the cadre in force in the mufassal; and

(b) Government servants who, though not liable to be employed in the mufassal, draw pay in a scale in force both in the City and in the mufassal :

Provided that in either case they are not occupying free of rent quarters either built or rented for them by the Government or have not been granted house-rent allowance in lieu thereof.

NOTE —(1) House allowance will not be admissible to the incumbent of a post in the City merely on the ground that the pay sanctioned for the post corresponds to the pay of some post in the mufassal. The duties of the posts must be comparable and doubtful cases should be referred to Government for decision.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rule (2), the officers specified under Class IV in Appendix I in Volume II of this Manual will not be eligible for house allowance.

(3) The allowance will be admissible only when the house-rent proper actually paid by a Government servant is in excess of 10 per cent of his emoluments, if the house is an unfurnished one, or 12½ per cent, if the house is a furnished one. The amount of the allowance will be the actual excess over 10 or 12½ per cent of the emoluments, as the case may be, subject to the following maxima :—

<i>Group.</i>	<i>Class of officers.</i>	<i>Maximum limit of monthly house allowance.</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)
	GAZETTED OFFICERS.	RS.
I.	All Government servants whose total emoluments excluding compensatory allowances exceed Rs. 1,000 ..	100
II.	Government servants, not included in Group I, the minimum pay of whose time-scale or whose graded or fixed pay is not less than Rs. 350	75
III.	All Government servants not included in Groups I and II.	50

4th November 1952]

Group.	Class of officers.	Maximum limit of monthly house allowance.
(1)	(2)	(3)
		RS.

NON-GAZETTED OFFICERS.

IV. Government servants in the City drawing an actual pay exceeding Rs. 150 per mensem who otherwise satisfy the conditions of Madras House Allowance	25
---	----

NOTE.—(1) Government servants drawing pay not exceeding Rs. 150 per mensem will draw the new house-rent allowance sanctioned in G.O. No. 78, Finance, dated 6th February 1947 and G.O. No. 732, Finance, dated 26th July 1948.

(2) For the purpose of this sub-rule, the term 'emoluments' will be interpreted as in Fundamental Rule 46-C, but will exclude any compensatory allowance and the term 'the house-rent proper actually paid' will be interpreted in accordance with instructions issued from time to time.

(3) The maximum limit of monthly house allowance for Subordinate Judges employed in posts in Madras City will be Rs. 75 (G.O. Ms. No. 1176, Finance, dated 2nd November 1951).

(4) The sanctioning authority may grant a reduced house allowance or refuse to grant a house allowance if it is satisfied that the Government servant is occupying an unnecessarily expensive house. The sanctioning authority shall consider in each case whether the Government servant could have obtained suitable accommodation at a rent lower than that actually paid, and the allowance granted shall in no case exceed that admissible on the basis of the lowest rent for which, in the opinion of the sanctioning authority, the Government servant could have obtained suitable accommodation.

(5) Heads of departments are empowered to sanction the allowance in respect of officers and subordinates under their control, except in cases where the person stays in a hotel and pays a consolidated rate for boarding and lodging.

The Chief Electrical Inspector to Government shall exercise the powers of a head of a department in respect of the officers and subordinates working under him. The allowance to the Chief Electrical Inspector to Government will be sanctioned by the Chief Engineer for Electricity. The power to sanction Madras House Allowance to officers and subordinates under the control of the Director of Public Instruction may be exercised by the Deputy Director of Public Instruction (Personnel) subject to such general instructions as the Director of Public Instruction may lay down for the Deputy Director's guidance. A copy of such instructions should be communicated to the Accountant-General. The power to sanction Madras House Allowance to the Deputy Directors including Deputy Director (Personnel) shall, however, remain with the Director of Public Instruction.

[4th November 1952]

(6) Claims for Madras House Allowance should be supported by a certificate from the Government servant concerned in the following form :—

“ Certified that the house allowance claimed by me for the month of _____ is in accordance with the rules governing the Madras House Allowance Scheme and that the rent due for the month aforesaid has been paid to the landlord.”

Heads of departments shall verify the fact of actual payment of the rent by directing the recipients to produce their house rent receipts at least once a year.

